

THE
GREAT SECRET
of
COUNT SAINT-
GERMAIN



by

Dr. Raymond Bernard

Republished 1998
by
The Book Tree
c/o P.O. Box 724
Escondido, California 92033

FOREWORD

No more baffling and perplexing character ever puzzled historians than that mysterious individual who suddenly appeared out of the unknown at the beginning of the eighteenth century, and, after flitting through the courts of Europe for a greater part of this century, then disappeared as mysteriously as he first appeared. Who he was, where he came from, what was his mission, and where he went after he was last seen, nobody knows or even ventures to guess. He is a perfect enigma.

Obviously of royal birth, though not the last heir of the house of Rakoczy as he claimed, he dealt with the crowned heads of Europe as equals, and they accepted him as such, considering him both as friend and counsellor, whether it was the unfortunate Louis XV, whose death at the guillotine he unsuccessfully tried to prevent, Emperor Frederick the Great, who called him "the man who never dies," or the Russian royalty. He mystified them all and kept them wondering about his identity, which was a constant subject of conversation and wonder in the courts of Europe, as was also his age, which was suspected to be much greater than his youthful appearance would indicate.

While he used many names, which he changed to suit the occasion, that most commonly assumed, though as fictitious as the rest, was that of Count Saint-Germain, the alchemical adept who was the marvel of Louis XV's court on the eve of the French Revolution, whose coming he predicted and at which he was present, after his feigned death in 1784.

In the following pages, we shall attempt to put together and reconstruct the following scattered fragments of the long and mysterious life of this adept, which started in the sixteenth century and continued on until the twentieth, during which time he used a series of names; and while his true name is Francis Tudor, son of Queen Elizabeth and last of the Tudors, the name under which he was known during the early part of his long life was that of Francis Bacon, since he was an adopted son of Lord and Lady Bacon, though his writings appeared under many assumed names, as Shakespeare, Christopher Marlowe, Spencer, Montaigne, Burton, Cervantes and others. Later in his life, after his feigned death in England and passage to the Continent, he adopted an enigmatical style of writing under various feigned names, as Valentine Andraes, Comte de Gabalis, etc., in order to conceal his identity; and from a philosopher, poet and dramatist as he was in England, he now became a Rosicrucian philosopher.

There is a widespread belief among modern occult organizations, as the Theosophical Society and the "I Am" Movement, that Saint-Germain is still alive as one of the great masters of these orders. According to the Brazilian Theosophical Society, he is now living in the Subterranean World as a member of an advanced civilization that exists there. Charles A. Marcoux, of Subsurface Research Center, 1311 West Cheryl Road, Phoenix, Arizona, claims to have contacted him and wrote the present thought: "I want to comment to you one thing which may be of interest, concerning Count Saint-Germain. Such a party has contacted me on several occasions, at least he claimed to be Count Saint-Germain." Barbara Moore, a Russian-born physician living in England, claims to have met him some years ago, learning from him the secret of rejuvenation, as did also the famous Frenchwoman, Ninon de L'Enclos, who, at the age of 90, looked like a young woman and was so beautiful that many suitors sought her hand in marriage. In 1933, the head of a Co-Masonic in San Jose, Costa Rica, told the writer that he had received a letter from him, as the world leader of this Order, coming from Carpathian Mountains. Manly Hall, his biographer, also told the author that in

1925, Saint-Germain was seen at a Masonic convention in France. A French student of Saint-Germain, Paul Masson, in a letter to the writer dated December 12, 1959, wrote:

"Regarding the Count Saint-Germain, I had a friend in Nice, France, when I resided there in 1952-53, who told me that when he studied in the French Lycee in his youth, there was in his class a remarkable young man whose name, believe it or not, was the Comte de St.-Germain. You probably know, of course, that there is no authentic record of Saint-Germain's death. He simply disappeared from the historical French scene--he who was credited with having, single-handedly, engineered the French Revolution!"

"I am interested in the biography you are writing about Saint-Germain; and only hope you will not miss some of the highlights of his career and his remarkable achievements, such as his mastery of all the European languages, which he spoke fluently and without any accent; his being one of the best swordsmen of his day; his technique with the violin which was only equalled later, but never surpassed, by Paganini; and the fact that he was a high adept is borne out by ample testimony to his remarkable powers of mind."

"He could write two different letters at the same time, using both hands. (He could also write the same letter with hand, each being such an exact copy of the other that when one was placed over the other and held up to a light, they were found to be identical, down to the last detail.) His ability to repeat word for word the contents of a newspaper he had read several days before is positive proof to my mind that he was an initiate of an occult school based on Oriental teachings. You may remember in Rudyard Kipling's 'Kim,' how the adept trained the youngsters' minds and powers of concentration by the well-known 'single glance' practice. The same technique was used by the Japanese to develop the 'picture holding' ability of their spies during World War II and was later the foundation for the training given the Russian master spies after the same war, and is the key to the remarkable success of their espionage system."

"An adept in the 'single-glance' technique is able to walk swiftly through a roomful of people, and in the few seconds it takes him to leave, he will have gained enough information of a most detailed kind, which will require him several hours of typing when he renders his report. In this brief instant of time, he will have, incredibly enough, had enough time to impress on his inner mental screen for instance, the entire contents of a letter which a man sitting in an armchair was slowly reading, in addition to noting the detailed facial features of a score of persons in the room, the small details of their dress, etc. You may remember that Robert Houdini in his autobiography, successfully practiced this single-glance system with his son, and his remarkable feats of clairvoyance and telepathy were simply the results of a trained mind."

"By the way, did you know that there is a picture of Count Saint-Germain? It can be seen in the Frik Collection in New York City. It was painted by Titian and is entitled 'The Polish Rider' (This picture appears in the frontispiece of the book *Comte de Gobelin*, which Saint-Germain, or Francis Bacon, who came from Germany as the 'Polish Rider,' delivered in a series of discourses to Abbe Monfaucon de Villars). I bought a large copy and sent it to Barbara Moore-Patsleewa, who had been wanting it for some time. If you have seen this picture, you may remember the high cheek bones. Well, I do not know of any comment on the matter ever having been made by anyone. This is probably due to the fact that Saint-Germain was presumed to have been of Polish ancestry, although no record of this has ever been found. But since there is a large Slavic element in Poland, the high cheek bones of Saint-Germain occasioned no comment... It is my conviction,

however, that Saint-Germain was not a European, but was an Asiatic, probably Tibetan or Mongolian. He was sent to Europe on a secret mission and with his fantastically developed powers, mental and occult, he was to bring about the downfall of an effete monarchy and effect an actual Renaissance of the free and liberated human spirit. (Author's note: The writer does not agree with Mr. Masson that Saint-Germain was of Asiatic origin, for certainly his face shows no Mongolian characteristics, which it should if he was of Tibetan or Chinese ancestry. In fact, there is every reason to believe, as Madame Blavatsky says in her *Isis Unveiled*, when speaking about the "Pehling" or European who was the marvel of the Tibetan lamasaries during the nineteenth century, when he resided there, that he was an Englishman, whose mastery of languages amazed everyone. Who else was he than Francis Bacon, author of the Shakespeare plays?)

"He succeeded admirably in his outer work, as testified to this day by the great democracy that France typifies. His inner work, however, will never be known by the profane, as it deals with the occult and was manifested in the secret schools of that time, notably those of the Freemasons. Cagliostro was one of Saint Germain's disciples and went to Poland to learn the alchemical art (according to Dr. Marc Haven). Later on, Cagliostro himself became very active in Free-masonry and founded the 'Egyptian Rite of Freemasonry,' opening the first lodge in Lyons, France.

"I have all the information on this Secret Rite; and if you can read French, you are welcome to read it one day. In there you will find a description of the rejuvenating elixir which Cagliostro used to restore youth to aging individuals. I have all the details of this strange operation, which consists of an almost forty day fast, during which only distilled water was used as the only liquid, together with an elixir called the 'Master's White Drops.' On the 33rd day, one will be seized with a paroxysm of evacuation from all channels of one's body, together with great perspiration through the pores of the skin. On the 35th day, one's hair and skin will be shed, followed by the loss of all one's teeth. On the 37th day, new skin will commence to form, and new teeth will start to grow. On the 40th day, a complete regeneration and rejuvenation will have been effected. The book says that if one repeats this secret operation every fifty years, one's physical immortality will be secured. Now that I am rereading this chapter on the Cagliostro method of rejuvenation, it calls to my mind a similar treatment recommended for the Indian sage, Ghandi, and which was according to the ancient prescription of the age-old Ayurvedic method of treating disease and restoring health, practiced in India since time immemorial. Ghandi never tried this treatment, but I can note many points of resemblance between the Indian method and that of Cagliostro." (Author's note: However, according to an article in the "New York Times," this method of rejuvenation was successfully applied to an aging follower of Ghandi under the guidance of a 178 year-old yogi, who was a specialist in this science, who himself looked no older than a man of forty. The method started with a 40 day fast to dissolve away accumulated deposits, as well as the use of certain rejuvenating herbs employed since time immemorial by the Ayurvedic school of medicine, including the famous Fo-ti Tieng, a variety of hydrocotyle asiatica, which is believed to regenerate the endocrine glands.)

In the following pages, we shall consider the long life of the mysterious individual who during the latter part of his long life used the name of Count-Germain, who was believed in occult circles to be a "reincarnation" of Francis Bacon, though, as clearly indicated by Udny in his "Later Incarnations of Francis Bacon," it was a habit of Rosicrucian philosophers to undergo feigned deaths in one country, only to later reappear in other countries under a new name and an altered appearance. Thus did Bacon reappear in Europe as Count Saint-Germain, after removing his goatee and altering his appearance.

Rather than present the biography of this long-lived adept in chronological order, commencing with his birth as the son of Queen Elizabeth and reviewing his life as Francis Bacon, we will first consider the later Saint-Germain phase of his life, after which we will consider his earlier phase as author of the Shakespeare plays. For, being a mysterious individual, we are justified in employing the method of retrogressive "tracing of identity," rather than that of the ordinary biographer.

“*It is the duty of every man to do his best, and it is the right of every man to do as he pleases.*”

Consequently, the first step in the analysis of the data is to estimate the parameters of the model. This can be done by using the maximum likelihood estimation (MLE) method. The MLE method involves finding the values of the parameters that maximize the likelihood function, which is defined as the probability of observing the given data given the parameters. The MLE method is a widely used statistical technique for estimating parameters in various models, including the GARCH model.

(Publisher's Note: Charles A. Marcoux, of Subsurface Research Center, as mentioned in the beginning of this Foreword is now deceased. He died on September 23, 1983.)

CHAPTER ONE

THE MAN OF MYSTERY

Count Saint-Germain

Francis Bacon - Valentine Andreas - the Polish Rider - Comte de Gabalis - Prince Rakoczy - Signor Gualdi - Count Saint-Germain: These were various aliases employed by the Man of Mystery to conceal his true origin as Francis Tudor, Prince of England, and rightful heir to the English throne. Could he have preserved this secrecy in order to protect his life from assassination by aspirants for the English throne, knowing too well the cupidity and baseness of those filled with such ambition, during his lifelong association with the English Court and service as Lord Chancellor, which he depicted in the historical Shakespeare plays he wrote?

Since his royal birth was only too apparent, and could not be denied since it was evidenced by his entire make-up and manner of speech and behavior, his favorite alibi was that he was a prince, but of a Hungarian rather than English royal house being the son of Prince Rakoczy, last heir of this royal line of Transylvania. With this confession, he conveniently avoided further questioning and resulting embarrassment, without denying the fact that he was a dispossessed prince and a throneless king--this throne being in Hungary rather than in England.

The most sympathetic book on this enigmatical character who baffled and confused the conventional biographer, was that of the Theosophical writer, I. Cooper-Oakley, *The Comte de St. Germain, the Secret of Kings*. In this book, as usual, Saint-Germain receives kinder treatment by a woman biographer than by one of his own sex. Referring to his complete mysteriousness, which baffled everyone, she quotes from the papers of Bentinck van Rhoon, dated April 18, 1760, who said: "No one knew who he was, a fact which did not astonish me in a country like England, where there are practically no secret police, but which did astonish me was that in France it was not known either."

Along the same line, Andrew Lang, in his *Historical Mysteries*, wrote, saying: "I am not aware that he has anywhere left his trail in official documents; he lives in more or less legendary documents alone. He is a will-o'-the-wisp of the memoir writers of the eighteenth century. Whenever you think you have a chance of finding him in good authentic State papers, he gives you the slip."

Napoleon III, puzzled and interested by what he had heard about the secret of the life of Count Saint-Germain, instructed one of his librarians to search for and collect all that could be found about him in archives and documents of the latter part of the eighteenth century. This was done, and a great number of papers, forming an enormous dossier, was deposited in the library of the prefecture of the police. The France-Prussian War and the Commune intervened, and the part of the building in which the dossier was kept was burnt. Magre, in his *Return of the Magi*, comments on this saying: "Thus once again an 'accident' upheld the ancient law that decrees that the life of an adept must always be surrounded with mystery."

Until Gustav Berthold Volz conducted his exhaustive research in the nineteen-twenties, Count Saint - Germain remained the man of mystery whom Frederick the Great candidly acknowledged him to be in his *History of the Seven Years' War*, describing him as "one of the most enigmatical personages of the eighteenth

century," as Grillot de Givry also pronounced him to be in his *Witchcraft, Magic and Alchemy*.

Mrs. Cooper-Oakley, convinced that Count Saint-Germain was still alive, industriously followed his traces wherever she could find them; and as against the idea that he is a legendary figure, records of him were found in the French National Record Office, the French Record Office of Foreign Affairs, the Dutch Palace Archives of Berlin, the Palace and State Archives in Vienna and the State Archives in Copenhagen.

As to the mystery of his origin and birth, as mentioned above, Saint-Germain, to conceal his secret, claimed to be the eldest son of Prince Rakoczy of Transylvania. In Paris he was "Saint-Germain," in London, "The Marquis of the Black Cross"; in Ubbergen he was Count Surmount; in Italy, "Count Bellamare;" in Venice, he was "Marquis de Montferrat;" in Pisa, he was "Chevalier Schoening;" in Genoa he was General Soltikov; and at Nuremberg he was General Welldone, a Russian general, which honor was bestowed on him by Count Alexei Orlov, Supreme Commander of the Russian Expedition in the Archipelago for his contribution to the Russian war effort by providing for his fleet "Saint-Germain tea," later known as Russian tea, a herbal combination he originated which acted as a mild laxative and was considered as a universal panacea. He also used the name of Tzarogy, obviously an anagram of Rokoczy, under which name he sometimes appeared.

Saint-Germain was first seen in 1710 in Venice, appearing then to the French ambassadress, Madame de Gergi, as a man about 45 years of age; and when she later met him in Paris 50 years later, he did not seem a day older, leading her to think that he was his son. She concluded that his remarkable preservation of youth was due to his use of a rejuvenating herbal elixir which he gave her at their first meeting, and which also preserved her youth, as we shall see below.

Where Saint-Germain came from when first seen in Venice, nobody knows. However, we find a hint in Jenning's *Rosicrucians, Their Rites and Mysteries*, in which we find a description of an almost identical individual in Venice in 1687, twenty-three years before, who used the name of Signor Gualdi and who, when questioned about his identity, immediately left town. Like Saint-Germain, he was an art connoisseur and had a collection of remarkable paintings. Manly Hall and others suspect the identity of the "sober signor," as he was known, with Count Saint-Germain. We can then trace him back to the Polish Rider who, in 1670, delivered to Abbe Monfaucon de Villars certain remarkable Rosicrucian discourses which were published under the title of *Comte de Cabalis*, a book that only a genius with unusual intelligence and capacity to conceal his identity and style of writing could originate, and this was 46 years after his feigned death in England as Francis Bacon in 1624.

There exists an autographed letter in his hand preserved in the British Museum, which was dated November 22, 1735, proving that he was then at The Hague. Morin, Baron von Gleichen's secretary, testified to meeting him in Holland in 1739. On December 9, 1745, Horace Walpole stated that he was said to have been in London for two years. This was during the rebellion of Charles Edward, the Young Pretender, which led to Saint-Germain, who was under suspicion, being apprehended, but he was later released when it was proven that he was innocent. Concerning this incident, Walpole, in his letters, wrote:

"The other day, they seized an odd man who goes by the name of Count Saint-Germain. He has been here these two years, and will not tell who he is, or whence, but professes that he does not go by his right name. He sings, plays on the violin wonderfully, composes, is mad, and not very sensible...The Prince of Wales has had unsatiated curiosity about him, but in vain."

In England, Saint-Germain befriended the famous writer, Bulwer Lytton, whom he instructed in Rosicrucianism, and who wrote his famous novel, *Zanoni*, with Saint-Germain as the central character, whom he represented as a Rosicrucian adept, an herbalist who possessed the secret of prolonging life.

According to Saint-Germain's own accounts, he was in India twice subsequently to 1745; and a letter written by him in 1773 described the second of these journeys made in the company of Watson and Clive in 1755. In this letter he mentions having a son, who was probably Bacon's son who played an important role in American colonization and in the early history of Virginia. There are confirmed rumors that he had a retreat in the Himalayas to which he periodically retired. He was probably a practitioner of yoga and was seen in yoga postures at certain occasions.

Who he was, where he came from, and his origin remained a perpetual enigma that puzzled Europe throughout the eighteenth century. Writing on "The Man of Mystery" in her book, *Myth of the Magi*, E. M. Butler says on this point:

"That so striking a personality should escape identification was a challenge, since it represented a gap in contemporary knowledge which, like any other void, had to be filled. Saint-Germain obeyed this law of nature when he declared himself to be Rakoczy. Before that day dawned, he deepened the mystery. He would describe his childhood in glowing colors, portraying himself with a large suite, wandering on splendid terraces in a glorious climate, as if (said the Baron Gieichen) he were heir to the throne of the king of Granda at the time of the Moors. To Madame de Genlis, then a girl of fourteen, in the presence of her skeptical mother, he told a moving story of wandering through the forests at the age of seven with a price upon his head, accompanied by his tutor and wearing a miniature of the mother he was never to see again in a bracelet around his wrist. To prove it, he showed the miniature. This false claim to royal blood (as the child's mother took it to be) might have been nearer the truth than she thought were he indeed a Rakoczy. (Author's comment: 'Here we have a concealed revelation of his royal origin as the son of Queen Elizabeth, a "mother he was never to see again," since after his birth she turned him to Lady Bacon to raise as her own son, to replace her own infant who died; and the "price upon his head" referred to the fact that he was a Prince of England, which, if permitted to be known, would result in his assassination by aspirants for the throne. In short, he correctly described himself as a king denied his throne, without stating in which country this throne existed.)

"Disappearing from one country to reappear in another without any kind of explanation, he certainly covered the greater part of Europe in his early lifetime, and was supposed to have gone much further. He himself claimed to have been in India; others declared that he told them he had been to Persia, Turkey, Japan and China; in which country, according to a not very reliable memoir writer, he had refused to give any name at all. The wonderfully vivid descriptions he gave of oriental countries in his conversations lent weight to the belief that he was familiar with them."

"A strong tradition exists that he was an extremely powerful and influential initiate, who founded more than one sect and was connected with them all. Saint-Germain himself told the Duke of Bouillon (evidently making fun of the incident) that more than two hundred persons in Paris, belonging to a society presided over by the Duke of Bouillon, had desired his acquaintance because they believed him to be a Master; and it is categorically affirmed that he was chosen as a representative of the great Masonic Conference in Paris in 1785, a year after his death."

During the eighteenth century, Saint-Germain sojourned with the royalty of Europe and bore credentials to admit him into the most exclusive circles of European nobility. During the reign of Peter the Great, he was in Russia; and from 1737 to 1742, in the court of the Shah of Persia as an honored guest. From Persia to France and from Calcutta to Rome, he was known and respected in royal courts. We have mentioned that Walpole knew him in London in 1745 and Clive in India in 1756. Madame d'Adhemar alleges she met him in Paris in 1789, five years after his supposed death, while other persons claimed they held conversations with him in the early nineteenth century, and some in the twentieth century. He was on familiar and intimate terms with the crowned heads of Europe and was the honored friend of many distinguished personages of all nations. Frederick the Great, Voltaire, Madame de Pompadour, Rousseau and Chatham all knew him personally, and rivalled each other in curiosity as to the origin of this mystery man. Writing on Saint-Germain's multi-colored life, Una Birch, in "The Nineteenth Century" (January, 1908) wrote:

"He was a Jacobite agent in London, a conspirator in St. Petersburg and an alchemist and connoisseur of paintings in Paris, and a Russian general at Naples. We find him fiddling in the music room of Versailles, gossiping with Horace Walpole in London, sitting in Frederick the Great's library at Berlin and conducting illuminist meetings in caverns by the Rhine."

In 1757, Saint-Germain appeared in Paris and was soon received at Court, where he mystified everyone by his incognito and possession of unusual powers. On this subject, Butler, in her book above referred to, writes:

"He was also such a brilliant conversationalist reconteur, so widely traveled, so deeply read, so learned, so light--hearted, so urbane, and with all so lavish and so splendid, that he outshone even his own diamonds and sparkling precious stones. Not only did he attain to a prestige, fame and power unparalleled in that cynical, skeptical and sophisticated society, but he maintained that position for a period of three years under the eyes of the great and in the penetrating rays of the fierce light that beats upon a throne. First insinuating himself into the good graces of Madame de Pompadour, he made the conquest of the king by virtue of his inherent power to fascinate, to entertain, to charm, persuade and convince. Louis XV, perennially in the last stages of boredom, and hard indeed to astonish or impress, was nevertheless taken out of himself when this remarkable newcomer transformed one of his flawed diamonds into a stone without blemish, and worth more than three times its original price.

"The man was obviously a wizard, and a most distinguished one at that. Miracles of this type, however, became stale by repetition; and it was one of the secrets of Saint-Germain's success that he aimed at interesting the intellect of his patrons quite as much as arousing their emotions. He made pupils of them, one and all. Louis XV was soon whiling away his hours of ennui in a laboratory fitted up for that purpose at Trianon. Like everyone else who ever took part in Saint-Germain's secret processes, he was convinced that there was big money in them, and that they were worth backing. He assigned to the inventor or discoverer apartments in the castle of Chambord, so that he might perfect his inventions to the incalculable benefit of the French dyeing industry and of the finances of the kingdom, then in a parlous state.

"The scintillating star at Court, who was admitted to the *petit soupers* of the king and to the private apartments of the favorite; the brilliant scientist who was to revolutionize industry and stabilize finance; the wonderful sage who possessed the secret of perpetual rejuvenation and might perhaps impart it to a chosen few, wielded (and indeed it was a foregone conclusion that he would) no negligible influence in the political sphere. More than one member of the French

Cabinet consulted him about affairs of state and even acted upon his advice. Saint-Germain was said to be responsible for the fall of the Controller General of Finance, Etienne de Sillhoutte in 1759. He had made himself prominent enough and trusted enough to be charged with a secret mission to the Hague in 1760 in connection with overtures of peace with England which were in the air at that time."

Saint-Germain's abilities as a statesman and diplomat seemed to have been highly appreciated by Louis XV, as were his achievements as a chemist and ennobler of gems, which led Louis to give him a suite of rooms in his residence, where he spent whole evenings at Versailles with the royal family. Tiring of the war with England and wishing to secretly negotiate peace, Louis selected Saint-Germain as the ideal person to go to The Hague on a secret diplomatic mission to the English representatives there, for the purpose of arranging peace.

But since the mission had been entrusted to him without the knowledge of the Minister of Foreign Affairs, the Duc de Choiseul, and since the French ambassador at The Hague, d'Affry, also had not been informed about it, when Saint-Germain came there and sought to execute Louis's orders, d'Affrey demanded a royal order against him, for his arrest, which the weak-willed Louis did not refuse.

D'Affrey, accordingly, communicated the order for his arrest to the Grand Pensionary of Holland, who brought it to the attention of the States-General assembled under the presidency of Bentinck. However, the latter, who was a friend of Saint-Germain, sent him word of it in advance, so giving him time to flee to England, where, however, he was not permitted to remain and forced to find refuge in Germany. Thus ended his effort to help Louis and end the war between England and France. But though unsuccessful as a peacemaker on this occasion, due to the jealousy and opposition of Choiseul and d'Affrey, he was more successful in arranging a treaty of peace between Germany and Austria in 1761, and in the events in Russia, in which he took part, which, in 1764, placed Catherine on the throne.

Saint-Germain had critics who misunderstood and maligned him, as he had friends who appreciated him, like Louis XV. One of his critics was the Danish statesman, Count Charles Wernstedt, who, writing in Silesia on November 24, 1779, said:

"We have the notorious adventurer Saint-Germain here.. He is the completest charlatan, fool, rattle-pate, wind-bag and in a certain sense, swindler, that the world has seen for many a long year.. Our prince esteems and honors him with all his might and heart.. In doing so, he is following his inborn inclination for that type of person." (Warnstedt was probably jealous of him.)

The French savant Thiebault, in his "Souvenirs," however, was more sympathetic, though equally incredulous, when he said:

"The history of Count of Saint-Germain displays a cleverer and more cautious adventurer (than Cagliostro) and nothing to offend the sense of honor. Nothing dishonest, everything marvelous, never anything mean or scandalous."

Kauderbach, who had been both dazzled and puzzled by Saint-Germain at first, on April 4, 1760, wrote from The Hague to Count Wackerbath-Salmour:

"This Saint-Germain has told us so many gross and palpable fairy stories, that one can listen to him with nothing but disgust on a second occasion, unless such braggings amuse one.. This man couldn't deceive a child of ten years, let

alone enlightened men. I regard him as an adventurer of the first water who is at the end of his tether, and I shall be very much surprised if he doesn't end tragically."

The Danish statesman Count Bernstorff, in a private letter written in 1779, said:

"I was neither his friend nor his admirer...I reserve my judgment, but I confess that I still incline strongly to distrust a man whose personality remains a perpetual riddle, who was forever making preposterous statements, continually changing his name, sometimes posing as an adept, at others as a great gentleman whom providence had blessed more richly than most."

Voltaire, perhaps sarcastically, wrote to his friend, Frederick the Great, of him, "He is a man who never dies and knows everything." Frederick probably got the expression, "the man who never dies," from Voltaire, who undoubtedly used it in a sarcastic sense.

The Prussian ambassador in Dresden, Alvensleben, was another critic of Saint-Germain, who, writing to Frederick on June 25, 1777, said:

"He is a highly gifted man with a very alert mind, but completely without judgment, and he has only gained his singular reputation by the lowest and basest flattery of which a man is capable, as well as by his outstanding eloquence, especially if one lets oneself be carried away by the fervor and enthusiasm with which he can express himself...Inordinate vanity is the mainspring driving his whole mechanism...He is stimulating and entertaining in society, so long as he is only narrating. But as soon as he tries to develop his own ideas, his whole weakness shows itself. But woe to him who would contradict him."

In sarcasm, the Danish admiral Count Danneskjold, writing to Saint-Germain from Amsterdam on April 27, 1760, said:

"I am well aware, Monsieur, that you are the greatest lord on earth."

Prince Golizyn, the Russian ambassador in London, writing to Kauderback on April 1, 1760, remarked:

"As for me, I, like yourself, think him somewhat of a fool."

But Saint-Germain had appreciators as well as critics among the statesmen of Europe. Bentinck von Rhoon, the Dutch statesman, on March 14, 1760, said of him:

"Yorke spoke of him as being a very cheerful and very polite man. His conversation pleased me very much, being exceedingly brilliant, varied and full of detail about various countries he had visited. I was exceedingly pleased with his judgment of persons and places known to me; his manners were exceedingly polite and went to prove that he was a man brought up in the best society."

Sypesteyn, in his *Historical Memoirs*, also writes of him appreciatively as follows:

"Saint-Germain was in many respects a remarkable man; and whenever he was personally known, he left a favorable impression behind, and the remembrance of many good and sometimes noble deeds. Many a poor father of a family, many a charitable institution, was helped by him in secret...Not one bad nor one dishonorable action was ever known of him, and so he inspired sympathy everywhere."

The Russian dramatist, Chekov, in his "Queen of Spades" refers to a book on occult sciences written by Saint-Germain when in St. Petersburg early in the eighteenth century, when he organized secret societies which probably played an important role in bringing on the Russian Revolution, just as his Freemasonic societies paved the way for the French and American Revolutions.

In her *Souvenirs of Marie Antoinette*, the Countess D'Adhemar described the Count as follows:

"It was in 1743 that the rumor spread that a foreigner, enormously rich, judging by the magnificence of his jewelry, had just arrived at Versailles. Where he came from, no one has ever been able to find out. His figure was well-knit and graceful, his hands delicate, his feet small and his shapely legs enhanced by well-fitting stockings. His nether garments, which fitted very closely, suggested a rare perfection of form. His smile showed magnificent teeth, a pretty dimple marked his chin. His hair was black and his glance soft and penetrating. And, oh, what eyes! Never have I seen their like. He looked about forty-five years old. He was often to be met within the royal apartments, where he had unrestricted admission at the beginning of 1768."

Count Saint-Germain was recognized as an outstanding scholar of his day, so usually overlooked and disregarded by historians to such an extent that he has become an almost mythical figure. His linguistic proficiency verged on the supernatural for he spoke most modern languages, and many ancient and Oriental ones, without any accent and as only one born in the respective countries would talk. He spoke German, English, Italian, Portuguese, Spanish, French, Greek, Latin, Sanskrit, Arabic and Chinese equally well, and with such fluency that when he visited lands where these languages were spoken, he was accepted as a native.

"Learned," writes one author about him, "speaking every civilized language admirably, a great musician, an excellent chemist, he played the part of a prodigy and played it to perfection. Madame de Pompadour extolls the genius of Saint-Germain as follows:

A thorough knowledge of all languages, ancient and modern, a prodigious memory, erudition, of which glimpses could be caught between the caprices of his conversation which was always amusing and occasionally very engaging, an inexhaustible skill in varying the tone and subjects of his converse, in being always fresh and in infusing the unexpected into the most trivial discourses made him a superb speaker. Sometimes he recounted anecdotes of the court of Valois or of princes still more remote, with such precise accuracy in every detail as almost to create the illusion that he had been an eyewitness of what he narrated. He had traveled the whole world over, and the king lent a willing ear to the narratives of his voyages over Asia and Africa and to his tales about the courts of Russia, Turkey and Australia. He appeared to be more intimately acquainted with the secret of each court than the charge d'affairs of the king."

According to our view that Saint-Germain was formerly Francis Bacon, son of Queen Elizabeth, who spent most of his time at the English court and was Lord Chancellor under King James, we can understand not only his unusual understanding of court etiquette and psychology, as displayed in the historical Shakespeare plays he wrote, but also his extraordinary capacity to deal with the crowned heads of Europe which he displayed during the eighteenth century, a talent which is difficult to acquire when not inborn as it was in his case. For he not only treated kings on a basis of equality, but possessed a natural royal bearing which was not affected and immediately noticeable wherever he went, which won for him, without any special effort on his part, the friendship of European royalty.

This is what his biographer, Cooper-Oakley, meant when she referred to the mystery of his life as "the secret of kings."

The following is an account of Saint-Germain's youthful appearance by those who knew him: "Saint-Germain is of medium height and has elegant manners. His features are regular; his complexion brown, his hair black; his face mobile and full of genius; his carriage bears the impress and the nobility common only to the great. The Count dresses simply but with taste. His only luxury consists of a large number of diamonds, with which he is fairly covered; he wears them on every finger, and they are set in his snuffboxes and his watches. One evening he appeared at court with shoe-buckles, which Herr von Contaut, an expert in precious stones, estimated as worth 200,000 francs.

"The Count Saint-Germain accompanied on the piano without music not only every song but the most difficult *concerti*, played on various instruments. Rameau was much impressed with the playing of this dilettante, and especially struck by his improvising.

"The Count paints beautifully in oils, but that which makes his paintings so remarkable is a particular color, a secret, which he has discovered, and which lends to the painting an extraordinary brilliance. Vanloo, who never tires in his admiration of the surprising coloring, has often requested the Count to let him participate in the secret. The latter, however, will not divulge it.

"One can, I think, well assert that a portion of his miracles is due to his knowledge of physics and chemistry, in which sciences he is well grounded. At all events it is palpable that his knowledge has laid the seeds for him of sound good health; a life which will, or which has, overstepped the ordinary time allotted to men; and has also endowed him with the means of preventing the ravages of time from affecting the body. Among other statements concerning the Count's astounding qualities, made to the Favorite by Mme. de Gergy after her first meeting with the Count, after a lapse of years, was that during her first stay in Venice, she received from him an elixir which for fully a quarter of a century, preserved unaltered the youthful charms she possessed at 25. Elderly gentlemen, whom Madame de Pompadour questioned concerning this peculiar incident, gave the assurance that the standing still of time in the aging and preservation of the youthful appearance of Mme. de Gergy, supported by the testimony of these old men, would make it appear still more probable."

In the realm of music, he was a master. While at Versailles, he gave concerts on the violin and at least once during his eventful life, he conducted a symphony orchestra without a score. In London his musical compositions were published, including his earliest English song, "Oh, Wouldst Though Know What Secret Charms." In 1760 he composed a great many new songs, and in 1780 a set of solos for the violin. It was said of him: "He was an industrious and capable artist and attracted a great deal of fashionable attention to himself both as composer and executant." He played excellently several musical instruments. It is generally agreed he was a musician of note, both as a concert performer, whose improvisations and playing were not only praised by the French composer, Rameau, but were found among the papers of Tschaikovsky at the time of his decease. The incident of the great Russian composer getting possession of his compositions was related in the following description of his stay in Russia:

"At St. Petersburg, Saint-Germain lived with Count Rotari, the famous painter, who was the painter of the beautiful portraits which are in the Peterhof Palace. Saint-Germain was a splendid violinist. He 'played like an orchestra.' N. Pyliaeff has seen (he cannot remember where now) a piece of music, some air for the harp, dedicated to Countess Ostermann by Saint-Germain's own

hand signed. It is bound beautifully in red maroquin. The date is about 1760... About the music signed by Saint-Germain, N. Pyiaeff now recollects that it belonged to him himself. He bought it at some sale and had it for some time. Then he gave it to the famous composer Peter Tschaikovsky as a present. It must now be among Tschaikovsky's papers. But since the great musician had little order, Pyiaeff thinks it very unlikely that it could be found."

The Count was ambidexterous to such an extent that he could write the same article with both hands simultaneously. When the two pieces of paper were afterwards placed one upon the other with the light behind them, the writing on one sheet exactly covered the writing of the other. He could repeat pages of print on one reading. To prove that the two lobes of his brain could work independently, he wrote a love letter with his right hand and a set of mystical verses with his left. Also he sang beautifully.

J. Cooper-Oakley, in her biography of Saint-Germain, referred to above, who was the most understanding of his admirers, said of him:

"Among the strange mysterious beings with whom the eighteenth century was so richly endowed, no one has commanded such universal comment and attention than the mystic who was known by the name of Count-Germain. A hero of romance, a charlatan, a swindler and an adventurer, rich and varied were the names that were showered on him. Hated by the man, loved and reverenced by the few, time has not lifted the veil which screened his true mission from the vulgar speculators of the period. Then, as now, the occultist was dubbed charlatan by the ignorant; only some men and women here and there realized the power of which he stood possessed. The friend and councillor of kings and princes, an enemy to ministers who were skilled in deception, he brought his great knowledge to help the West, to stave off in some small measure the storm clouds that were gathering so thickly around some nations. Alas! His words of warning fell on deafened ears, and his advice went all unheeded."

Madame Blavatsky, another of Saint-Germain's women appreciators, denounced the claim that he was an adventurer by saying: "Do charlatans enjoy the confidence and admiration of the cleverest statesmen and nobles of Europe for long years?"

In honor of Saint-Germain, whose picture, as Prince Rakoczy, he placed on the frontispiece of his \$100 book on Rosicrucianism, Alchemy, Masonry and other occult sciences, Manly Hall writes:

"When asked once about himself, he replied that his father was the Secret Doctrine and his mother the Mysteries. St. Germain was thoroughly conversant with the principles of Oriental concentration, upon several occasions having been seen seated with his feet crossed and hands folded in the posture of a Hindu Buddha. He had a retreat in the Himalayas to which he retired periodically from the world. On one occasion, he declared that he would remain in India for eighty-five years and then return to the scene of his European labors. At various times he admitted that he was obeying the orders of a power higher and greater than himself. What he did not say was that this superior power was the Mystery School which had sent him into the world to accomplish a definite mission. The Comte de St. Germain and Sir Francis Bacon are the two greatest emissaries sent into the world by the Secret Brotherhood in the last thousand years. (Hall here evidently fears to admit that they were both the same individual, in spite of the fact that in other writings he refers to Bacon's feigned death and mysterious disappearance. Could such a brilliant mind, which produced both the works that go by his name and the Shakespeare plays, plus countless other literary masterpieces under different fictitious names, suddenly cease all

activities as his generally believed by those who accept the fact that his death in 1624 in England was feigned, since he was not later found in his grave? Could he have vanished completely and abandoned the work he labored with a new appearance, seeking to realize ideals he had formerly presented in literary, philosophical and dramatic form?)

"The principles disseminated by the Comte de St.-Germain were undoubtedly Rosicrucian in origin and permeated with the doctrines of the Gnostics. The Comte was the moving spirit of Rosicrucianism during the eighteenth century--possibly the actual head of the order--and is suspected of being the great power behind the French Revolution. There is also reason to believe that Lord Bulwer Lytton's famous novel, *Zanoni*, was actually concerned with the life and activities of St. Germain. He is generally regarded as an important figure in the early activities of the Freemasons."

According to Butler, the reading of *Zanoni* made a great impression on Madame Blavatsky and constituted the germ of the Theosophical movement that she later started. The central figure of this book is a Rosicrucian adept who possessed a deep knowledge of the rejuvenating power of herbs and the art of prolonging life, and who played an important role in the French Revolution--so who else could this have been but Saint-Germain, whom its author, Bulwer Lytton, knew personally? Concerning Saint-Germain, Manly Hall writes further in a manner that could well apply to Francis Bacon:

"Against the background of ignorance and purposeless pedantry stands out sharply and clearly the luminous personality of the Comte de St.-Germain. Master of the old wisdom, wise in forgotten truths, proficient in all the curious arts of antiquity, learned beyond any other man of the modern world, the mysterious Comte personified in his own incredible achievements the metaphysical traditions of fifty centuries. A thousand times the questions have been asked: Where did St.-Germain secure his astonishing knowledge of natural law? How did he perpetuate himself from century to century, defying the natural corruption which brings prince, priest and pauper alike to a common end? St. Germain was the mouthpiece and representative of the brotherhood of philosophers which had descended in an unbroken line from the hierophants of Greece and Egypt. He had received the Logos. By his wisdom he had confounded the elders. The life of one man puts to naught the scholastic smugness of two thousand years."

This seems to be exactly what Francis Bacon, founder of modern science and inductive and experimental philosophy, who liberated human thought from nearly two thousand years of sterile Aristotelian scholasticism, had accomplished. After his feigned death in England, Bacon appeared in Europe as leader of the Rosicrucian and Freemasonic movements he previously started in his home country. After laboring during the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries in Europe, at the beginning of the nineteenth century, he departed for the Far East, where he remained during this century. Bacon and Saint-Germain were the same man at two different states of his long life. While he was able to alter his appearance, his stature, which was much more difficult to alter, remained unchanged; and this constitutes telltale evidence of his identity under his two successive appearances during the three centuries of his known life, the sixteenth, seventeenth and eighteenth.

CHAPTER TWO

SAINT-GERMAIN'S GREAT SECRET:

THE ART OF REJUVENATION

Bulwer Lytton, when he described Saint-Germain in his philosophical novel, *Zanoni*, referred to him as both a Rosicrucian adept and a herbalist who had profound knowledge of the occult virtues of herbs, by which knowledge he achieved his apparent miracles, including the indefinite prolongation of youth and life, which was one of the great goals of the Rosicrucians, who were called the "long-livers." He was believed by all to possess a mysterious herbal elixir, by means of which he preserved his youth and prolonged his life.

Saint-Germain's medical knowledge of herbalism was held in high estimation by his admirers; and "Saint-Germain tea" still bears his name as a record of this fact. It is a mild laxative and contains senna; and was regarded as a panacea since it purifies the intestines and overcomes autointoxication which is the basic cause of most disease. As we have already indicated, it was later called "Russian tea," because during the Russian expedition to the Archipelago, it was supplied by him in bulk to the fleet, helping keep the men well, whereas otherwise, climatic adversities would probably make them sick. For this service he was made a Russian general who called himself General Welldone, a name which probably referred to his contribution to the Russian navy. He wore the official uniform of a Russian general when he met his friend, Count Orloff, supreme commander of the expedition, at Nuremburg in 1774.

Saint-Germain's fame as a herbalist was, however, due not only to his laxative tea, but to his mysterious rejuvenating elixir which he used himself and which he guarded in secrecy. This was considered to constitute the secret of his perpetual youth, as indicated by his experiment with Madame de Gergy, who remained unchanged for fifty years between her first meeting with him in Venice in 1710 and their later meeting in Paris a half a century later, as did the Count himself. When Madame de Gergy first met him, in 1710, he looked like a man of forty-five, and when she met him fifty years later, he looked not a day older. Word spread; and his secret of perpetual youth was then attributed to his possession of a marvelous rejuvenating herbal elixir, which was the coveted secret of the alchemical philosophers of whom he was supposed to be a leading adept, if not their grand master.

Those who knew him intimately believed that his perennial youth was not natural but due to his possession of a great secret; and this secret was his possession of the fabled Elixir of Life of the Rosicrucians, by means of which he was able to resist the ravages of time and remain unaffected by its passage through the centuries, from the sixteenth when he was born until the twentieth, when he was last seen, as youthful and vigorous as ever. Jennings, in his book on the Rosicrucians, mentions such a herbal elixir as one of the secret possessions of this order of sages, which, when once given to an old woman, caused her to become young again and to manifest all the symptoms and traits of a young woman. A similar rejuvenation probably occurred in the case of the aged Madame de Gergy, who appeared like a young woman due to her fifty years' use of Saint-Germain's rejuvenating elixir.

Another woman who was rejuvenated by Saint-Germain, or rather preserved in a state of continued youth from her girlhood until the age of ninety, when she was so youthful and beautiful that many suitors sought her hand, not knowing her

real age, was the celebrated Frenchwoman, Ninon de L'Enclos, who met Saint-Germain when she was young. He offered her the choice among three gifts: the gift of wealth, the gift of beauty and the gift of perpetual youth. She wisely chose the latter gift, since it bestows on one the other two. He then imparted to her his Great Secret, the secret of remaining young forever. This probably consisted in the same rejuvenating herbal elixir that he gave Madame de Gergy many years before. Just as it preserved the youthful appearance that the Madame had in her twenties, when he later met her in her seventies fifty years later, so it enabled Ninon de L'Enclos, when she was fifty, to look like a girl of 18; and preserved her in the same youthful state for forty years longer, until she was 90, when she looked so young and beautiful that her own nephew fell in love with her so madly that he was on the verge of committing suicide. But he was only one among many desperate suitors who sought her hand.

Just what did Saint-Germain give Ninon de L'Enclos that kept her young at the age of 90? It was such a powerful rejuvenator that it is said that when one takes it, one's teeth and hair fall out and are replaced by new perfect teeth and new hair of natural color. Since it is so powerful in its action, most people who have tried it got frightened and discontinued its use. However, if they had persevered, as Ninon did, they would probably find that Saint-Germain's marvelous herbal elixir would make them young again as it kept Madame de Gergy and Ninon de L'Enclos young, and as it kept himself young.

Manly Hall notes that Saint-Germain gave much attention to the rejuvenating properties of mandrake, known as "the herb of the sorcerers," since they used it to restore youth. In the book, *The Mystic Mandrake*, there is mention of a Russian gentleman in his 70's who looked no older than a man of forty. Investigation revealed that he was a steady user of this rejuvenating herb which, like Saint-Germain's tea, acts as an intestinal cleanser, only more powerful in its action. It is similar to ginseng, the rejuvenating herb of the Chinese, which, due to its manlike appearance, like mandrake, has been called the "man plant."

The yogis of India use hydrocotyle asiatica, especially its potent variety known as fo-ti tieng, for purposes of prolonging youthful vigor of body and brain. Could Saint-Germain have learned about this herb during his visit to India and did he include it in his rejuvenating elixir? And since he spoke Chinese and is claimed to have visited China, did he not know about the rejuvenating power of ginseng and have included this herb too? As a herbalist, and an expert in the art of rejuvenation, he probably made a special study of the rejuvenating herbs of the Far East when he visited the Orient.

Modern endocrinologists are agreed that the endocrine glands hold the secret of youth. They are vigorous in youth and their degeneration in later years brings on senility. If these glands may be vitalized and regenerated by the action of certain herbs, as ginseng, which seems to be an activator of the gonads and to prevent sterility, then these herbs should tend to produce rejuvenation. It is probable that Saint-Germain gathered from all parts of the world rejuvenating herbs that accomplish just this and combined them into a super potent herbal elixir for the purpose of preserving and restoring youth. For a detailed description of these rejuvenating herbs, read the writer's book *Herbal Elixirs of Life*.

A third woman who met Count Saint-Germain and was rejuvenated was the Russian born physician, Barbara Moore-Pataleewa, a specialist in rejuvenation who studied with the physiologist, Boglemetz. She based her method by which she resisted the aging process on her interpretation of the fact that the Count was never seen to eat, even at royal dinner tables, when he diverted his host's attention from this fact by his endless anecdotes and brilliant conversation. After living on a

strictly vegetarian diet of raw foods, Barbara lived for nine years on dandelion juice and then on water and honey for many years, taking no solid food. During this time, she displayed remarkable energy in mountain climbing for months at a time. Lately she came first in long distance races which are now a fad in England. Her method of rejuvenation seemed to consist in conservation of digestive energy ordinarily wasted in the digestion, assimilation and excretion of excessive and unnecessary foods. She claims that both proteins and starches are entirely unnecessary.

From the above it appears that Saint-Germain found more open-minded followers among women than among men, just as his most sympathetic biographer, Cooper-Oakley, was a woman, as also was E. M. Butler, whose deep sympathy for him is hidden behind a superficial cynicism that her academic position as a Cambridge professor requires.

Willemans, in his *History of Rosicrucianism*, wrote about Saint-Germain as follows:

"According to the testimony of all who knew Saint-Germain intimately, he has left the reputation of being a marvelous person. In the ordinary man he awakened distrust. A curious detail of his life is that he never ate in the presence of others. Thanks to his complete chastity and to the use of his 'Elixir of Life,' he presented features astonishingly unchanged. Except toward the end of his life, he seemed no older than a man of forty years."

The general opinion of the time was that Saint-Germain was several centuries of age. Questioned about this by Louis XV, Saint-Germain replied: "Sire, I sometimes amuse myself, not by making it believed, but by allowing it to be believed, that I have lived in ancient times." On this statement, Wittermans comments: "This amusement was, nevertheless, more active than passive, for his contemporaries related that he gave all kinds of narrations about past centuries, as if he had lived in them."

Saint-Germain's physical perfection and perpetual youth was probably due to his very strict diet, as well as his marvelous herbal elixir, plus his violable chastity and his diet or lack of diet. He is generally regarded as being a strict vegetarian who ate no meat and drank no wine; and never deviated from these principles as did the ill-fated Thomas Parr, the English vegetarian who, when over 150 years of age and in perfect health, partook to his palace to dine with him, paying with his life for this transgression. Saint-Germain was smarter, for by his brilliant conversation and fascinating anecdotes he was able to divert the mind of his royal host from the fact that he ate and drank nothing of the lavish spread placed before him.

One writer said of him, "He always dined alone and very simply. His wants were very few. It was impossible while at Anspach to persuade him to dine at the Prince's table." However, since nobody ever saw him dine, there is no proof that he ate at all. Was he one of those long-lived adepts who lived without eating, a state achieved by some long-lived yogis in the Himalayas? (These yogis are claimed to live without eating, drinking, defecating or urinating. Barbara Moore-Pataleewa, the Russian woman physician referred to above as abstaining from solid food for years, found that her stomach contracted to nearly the size of the rest of the alimentary canal, so that intake of solid food became impossible, while intestinal excretions were reduced to the point of disappearance. The resulting conservation of glandular secretions, hormones and other vital substances ordinarily lost in the intestinal excretions are believed to have been a major factor responsible for the rejuvenating effects of fasting over shorter or longer periods.)

All of Saint-Germain's biographers are agreed on the point that he was never seen to eat. When invited to the most sumptuous repasts at the tables of kings, Saint-Germain resolutely refused to eat any food.

Saint-Germain is described as looking like a man of middle age, or at least seeming so, even if much older, due to his possessing the secret of eternal youth, the goal of the alchemical philosophers of whom he was supposed to have been an outstanding adept. His face was devoid of wrinkles, and he was free from any physical infirmity, enjoying at all times perfect and undeviating health. That he formerly wore a goatee when he was Francis Bacon, but shaved it to conceal his identity when he adopted the name of Count Saint-Germain, is indicated by the fact that once, after a period of confinement, when Casanova visited him, he found him with a partly regrown beard.

In *Hermippus Redivivus: Or the Sage's Triumph Over Old Age and Death*, published in London in 1749 and translated by John Campbell from the German of Dr. Cohausen, we read the following which sheds much light on the Man of Mystery, who was a Rosicrucian adept, or rather the true founder of the order:

"The adepts are obliged to conceal themselves for the sake of safety, and... having power not only of prolonging their lives, but also of renovating their bodies, they take care to use it with the utmost discretion, and instead of making a display of this prerogative, they manage it with the highest secrecy—the true cause of the world's being so much in doubt about this matter. Hence it comes to pass that through an adept is possessed of greater wealth than is contained in the mines of Peru, yet he always lives in so moderate a manner, as to avoid all suspicion, and so is never to be discovered, unless by some unfortunate accident."

In this same book, the following account is given of such an adept, who went by the name of Signor Gualdi, but who was really Count Saint-Germain:

"There happened in the year 1687 an odd accident at Venice, that made a great stir then, and which I think deserves to be rescued from oblivion. The great freedom and ease with which all persons, who make a good appearance, live in that city, is known sufficiently, to all who are acquainted with it. Such will not therefore be surprised that a stranger, who went by the name of Signor Gualdi, and who made a considerable figure there, was admitted into the best company, though nobody knew who or what he was. He remained at Venice some months, and three things were remarked in his conduct. The first was, that he had a small collection of fine pictures, which he readily showed to anybody that desired it; the next, that he was perfectly versed in all arts and sciences, and spoke on every subject with such readiness and sagacity, as astonished all who heard him; and it was in the third place observed, that he never wrote or received any letter; never desired any credit, or made use of bills of exchange, but paid for everything in ready money, and lived decently though not in splendor.

"This gentleman met one day at a coffee-house with a Venetian nobleman, who was an extraordinarily good judge of pictures. He had heard of Signor Gualdi's collection, and expressed his satisfaction, by telling him, that he had never seen a finer considering the number of pieces of which it consisted, he cast his eye by chance over the chamber door, where hung a picture of this stranger. The Venetian looked upon it, and then upon him. 'This picture was drawn for you, Sir?' he said to Signor Gualdi, to which the other made no answer, but made a low bow. 'You look,' continued the Venetian, 'like a man of fifty, yet I know the picture to be of the hand of Titian, who was been dead one hundred and thirty years. How is this possible?'

"It is not easy,' said Signor Gualdi gravely, 'to know all things that are possible; but there is certainly no crime in my being like a picture drawn by Titian.'

"The Venetian easily perceived by his manner of speaking that he had given the stranger offense, and therefore took his leave. He could not forbear speaking of this in the evening to some of his friends, who resolved to satisfy themselves by looking upon the picture the next day. In order to have an opportunity of doing so, they went to the coffee-house about the time that Signor Gualdi was wont to come thither; and not meeting with him, one of them who had often conversed with him went to his lodgings to inquire after him, where he heard that he had set out an hour before for Vienna. This affair made a great noise, and found a place in all the newspapers of that time."

According to Manly Hall, this 'sober' Signor Gualdi was none other than Saint-Germain, who, 23 years later, was seen in Venice again by Madame Gergy in 1710. It is well known that he was an art collector and painter himself, whose art collection enriched the halls of the French king with his pictures, including paintings by Valasquez and Murillo.

Jennings, in his *The Rosicrucians, Their Rites and Mysteries*, gives a different version of the above incident. Signor Gualdi invited a friend and his beautiful young daughter to look at his art collection. Struck by his youth and beauty and ignorant of his age, the young lady was infatuated with him, which reminds one of a similar incident described by Bulwer Lytton in *Zanoni*.

Jennings gives the following account of Signor Gualdi:

"A stranger who arrived in Venice one summer, toward the end of the seventeenth century, and who took up his residence in one of the best sections of the city, by the considerable figure which he made, and through his own manners, which were polished, composed and elegant, was admitted into the best company--this though he came with no introductions, nor did anybody exactly know who or what he was. His figure was exceedingly elegant and well-proportioned, his face oval and long, his forehead ample and pale, and the intellectual faculties were surprisingly brought out, and in distinguished prominence. His hair was long, dark and flowing; his smile inexpressibly fascinating, yet sad; the deep light of his eyes seemed laden, to the attention of those noting him, with the sentiments and experiences of all the historical periods. But his conversation, when he chose to converse, and his attainments and knowledge, were marvelous; though too much, yet not with an ostentatious reticence. He went by the name of Signor Gualdi and was looked upon as a plain interesting character; in short, one to make an observer speculate concerning him.

"This gentleman remained at Venice for some months, and was known by the name of 'The Sober Signor' among the common people, on account of the regularity of his life, the composed simplicity of his manners, and the quietness of his costume; for he always wore dark clothes and those of a plain, unpretending style.

"Signor Gualdi met, shortly after his arrival at Venice one day, at the coffeehouse which he was in the habit of frequenting, a Venetian nobleman of sociable manners, who was very fond of art, and this paid used to engage in sundry discussions; and they had many conversations concerning the various objects and pursuits which were interesting to both of them. Acquaintance ripened into friendly esteem; and the nobleman invited Signor Gualdi to his private house, whereat--for he was a widower--Signor Gualdi first met the nobleman's daughter, a very beautiful young maiden of eighteen, of much grace and intelligence, and of great accomplishments.

"The nobleman's daughter was just introduced at her father's house from a convent, or pension, where she had been educated by the nuns. This young lady, in short, from constantly being in his society, and listening to his interesting narratives, gradually fell in love with the mysterious stranger, much for the reasons of Desdemona; though Signor Gualdi was no swarthy Moor, but only a well-educated gentleman--a thinker rather than the desirer to be a doer. At times, indeed, his countenance seemed to grow splendid and magical in expression; and he boasted certainly wondrous discourse; and a strange and weird fascination would grow up about him, as it were, when he became more than usually pleased, communicative and animated.

"Altogether, when you were thinking about him, he seemed a puzzling person, and of rare gifts; though when mixing only with the crowd, you would scarcely distinguish him from the crowd; nor would you observe him, unless there was something romantically akin to him in you excited by his talk. He was eventually suspected of being one of the strange people, or Rosicrucians, or Ever-Livers, of whom we are treating. This was from mysterious circumstances afterwards in relation to him, and which are in print."

Then follows a description of the visit of the father and the young lady to his art collection and their being struck by a painting placed in an inconspicuous place near the door, which bore a distinct likeness to Saint-Germain, though it was evidently the work of an old master and done over a century ago. When his attention was called to this painting, he became embarrassed and excused himself, and was no longer seen in that town, much to the sorrow of the young lady.

According to Madame de Pompadour, Saint-Germain claimed to possess the secret of eternal youth, which enabled him to pass through the centuries without ageing. It was for this reason that Frederick the Great called him "the man who never dies." This belief in his physical immortality, which was quite widespread, was supported by his youthful appearance in spite of his incredible and unknown age, which he never revealed to anyone, always evading a direct answer to this question when asked. The octogenarian Madame de Gergy, widow of the French ambassador in Venice, as we have already indicated, declared she had seen the Count there in 1710, looking about forty-five years of age, and when she met him in Paris fifty years later, he looked not a day older; and she naturally supposed him to be his own son. And we have also referred to the fact that she, too, thanks to the rejuvenating herbal elixir which Saint-Germain had given her when they first met, also preserved her youth during this period. We quote the following account of this incident from one of the earliest records about Saint-Germain (records about him extending from 1710, when he was first seen in Venice until 1822, when last seen, prior to his departure for Tibet):

"There appeared at the Court (of Louis XV) in these days a very extraordinary man, who called himself Count Saint-Germain. At first he distinguished himself through his cleverness and great diversity of talents, but in another respect he soon aroused the greatest astonishment.

"The old Countess de Gergy, who fifty years earlier had accompanied her husband to Venice, where he had the appointment of ambassador, lately met Saint-Germain at Mme. de Pompadour's. For some time she watched the stranger with signs of the greatest surprise, in which was mixed not a little fear. Finally, unable to control her excitement, she approached the Count more out of curiosity than in fear.

"Will you have the kindness to tell me," said the Countess, "whether your father was in Venice in the year 1710?"

"No, Madame," replied the Count unconcerned. "It is very much longer since I lost my father, but I myself was living at the end of the last and the beginning of this century. I had the honor to pay you court then, and you were kind enough to admire a few Barcaroles of my composing which we used to sing together."

"Forgive me, but that is impossible. The Count Saint-Germain I knew in those days was at least 45 years old; and you, at the outside, are that age at present," the countess replied. "Fifty years ago," she continued, "I was ambassadress at Venice, and I remember seeing you there looking just as you do now, only somewhat riper in age perhaps, for you have grown younger since then."

Bowing low, the Count answered with dignity: "I have always thought myself happy in being able to make myself agreeable to the ladies."

Madame de Gergy continued: "You then called yourself the Marquis Balletti."

The Count bowed again and replied: "And Countess de Gergy's memory is still as good as it was fifty years ago."

The Countess smiled and said: "That I owe to an elixir you gave me at our first meeting. You are really an extraordinary man."

The Count assumed a grave expression and said: "Did this Marquis Balletti have a bad reputation?"

"On the contrary," replied the Countess, "he was in very good society."

The Count shrugged his shoulders expressively saying, "Well, as no one complains of him, I adopt him willingly as my grandfather."

Since Count Saint-Germain could not explain to her how he could be the same person and not his own father, he avoided further discussion on the subject by remarking with a smile, "Madame, I am very old."

"But then you must be nearly a hundred years old," added the Countess.

"That is not impossible" was the Count's enigmatical reply.

Countess d'Adhemar was present during the entire conversation and vouches for its accuracy in every detail.

Other evidences of Saint-Germain's great age are afforded by the memoirs of Madame de Hausset, lady-in-waiting to Madame de Pompadour, who wrote down the ensuing conversation that took place between the Madame and the Count, when she took the opportunity to question him about his age, which question, as usual, he cleverly avoided answering. The incident occurred when Saint-Germain was describing historical events of the remote past with a vividness which made even the most incredulous believe that he must have been an eye-witness of what he described. Referring to this fact, Madame de Pompadour laughed and asked, "Apparently you have seen it all yourself?"

To this the Count replied: "I have a very good memory, and I have studied French history in detail. I sometimes amuse myself not by *making* people believe, but by *allowing* them to believe that I have lived in the oldest times."

"Still you never say how old you really are, and you claim to be very old," replied the Madame, adding, "The Countess de Gergy, who was ambassadress fifty

years ago, I believe in Venice, declared that she knew you then looking just as you do now."

"It is perfectly true, Madame, that I made the acquaintance of the Countess de Gergy a long time ago," the Count replied.

"But according to her, you must be over a hundred years old now," the Madame said.

"That is not impossible," he replied laughing, "but, as I admit, it is even more possible that the revered lady is talking nonsense."

It was through such subterfuges and evasions that he perpetually avoided any definite statement about his age and kept his secret intact, to the consternation and wonderment of his inquirers. It was answers like he gave to Madame de Pompadour that led Gustav Bord to write to Saint-Germain that "he allows a certain mystery to hover about him, a mystery which awakens curiosity and sympathy. Being a virtuoso in the art of misleading, he says nothing that is untrue, but he knows how (by silence rather than by learned discussions) to let people believe the mistaken legends that are current about him. He has the rare gift of remaining silent and profiting by it."

Let us now return to Madame de Haussset's story.

"You gave Madame de Gergy," pressed Madame de Pompadour, "an elixir surprising in its effects. She claims that for a long time she appeared to be no older than twenty-four. Why should you not give some to the king?"

Saint-Germain allowed an expression of feigned terror to spread over his face, said, "Ah, Madame, I should be mad indeed to take it into my head to give the king an unknown drug."

The following is an example of the mischievous and enigmatical manner with which Saint-Germain kept everyone guessing about his age:

"These silly Parisians," he once told Gleichen, "believe that I am 500 years old, and I confirmed them in that belief, for I see that they get a lot of pleasure out of it. Not but what I am immeasurably older than I appear." (From Gleichen's "Souvenirs," which was first published in 1818.)

As for the far-fetched and exaggerated claims circulating to the fact that Saint-Germain pretended to have been present at the Council of Nicea, and to have conversed with Christ, etc., these originated in an impersonator nicknamed Lord Gower, who introduced himself to Parisian society as Count Saint Germain, and they were not made by the real Saint-Germain, who, because of his unchanging youth down through the centuries, was believed to possess the philosopher's stone and the Elixir of Life, and from this developed puerile anecdotes of old ladies taking too much of the Elixir and becoming little girls, babies or even embryos.

The following conversation is reported between Saint-Germain and Countess de Genlis, then a child of ten:

"One evening, at a party, Saint-Germain accompanied several Italian airs for the young Countess, afterwards so celebrated under the name of Countess de Genlis, then aged ten years.

"When she finished singing, the Count said to her: 'In five or six years, you will have a very beautiful voice, which you will preserve for a long time.'

In order to perfect its charm, you should also preserve your beauty. This will be your happy fate between your 16th and 17th year.'

"But, Count,' answered the child, while allowing her pretty fingers to glide over the keys, 'that does not lie in one's power.'

"O yes," answered the Count carelessly, 'only tell me whether it would give you pleasure to remain as you are at that age.'

'That would be charming,' she replied.

"Well, I promise it to you," the Count said, and spoke of other matters.

The Count was now so absorbed in his thoughts that he did not notice

that the girl had been silent for some time. "What is it?" asked the Count.

"I have mentioned that Saint-Germain carried around with him a miniature of a very beautiful woman attached to his arm, who wore a peculiar costume, who he said was his mother."

"To what date does that dress belong?" he was asked.

Without answering, he put his sleeve down and brought forward another topic. Was

she Queen Elizabeth, dressed in the peculiar costume she usually wore?

"I am not quite sure about that," said the Count.

"Tell me, blog erit ymouz smemper of elde erit beveiled erit nymrie-mlie?

"On the floor stood a silver stand holding a silver bowl containing a white lily. In the center of the bowl was a small diamond ring.

"I have never seen such a thing before," said the Count, "but it is very

curious. Who can it belong to? It must be a princess or a queen."

"It is a diamond ring which I have just received from my mother. She gave it to me as a gift on my birthday. It is very valuable and I have never seen anything like it before."

"It is a diamond ring which I have just received from my mother. She gave it to me as a gift on my birthday. It is very valuable and I have never seen anything like it before."

"It is a diamond ring which I have just received from my mother. She gave it to me as a gift on my birthday. It is very valuable and I have never seen anything like it before."

"It is a diamond ring which I have just received from my mother. She gave it to me as a gift on my birthday. It is very valuable and I have never seen anything like it before."

"It is a diamond ring which I have just received from my mother. She gave it to me as a gift on my birthday. It is very valuable and I have never seen anything like it before."

"It is a diamond ring which I have just received from my mother. She gave it to me as a gift on my birthday. It is very valuable and I have never seen anything like it before."

"It is a diamond ring which I have just received from my mother. She gave it to me as a gift on my birthday. It is very valuable and I have never seen anything like it before."

"It is a diamond ring which I have just received from my mother. She gave it to me as a gift on my birthday. It is very valuable and I have never seen anything like it before."

"It is a diamond ring which I have just received from my mother. She gave it to me as a gift on my birthday. It is very valuable and I have never seen anything like it before."

"It is a diamond ring which I have just received from my mother. She gave it to me as a gift on my birthday. It is very valuable and I have never seen anything like it before."

"It is a diamond ring which I have just received from my mother. She gave it to me as a gift on my birthday. It is very valuable and I have never seen anything like it before."

"It is a diamond ring which I have just received from my mother. She gave it to me as a gift on my birthday. It is very valuable and I have never seen anything like it before."

"It is a diamond ring which I have just received from my mother. She gave it to me as a gift on my birthday. It is very valuable and I have never seen anything like it before."

"It is a diamond ring which I have just received from my mother. She gave it to me as a gift on my birthday. It is very valuable and I have never seen anything like it before."

CHAPTER THREE

COUNT SAINT-GERMAIN AS A ROSICRUCIAN ADEPT

Saint-Germain's illimitable wealth, without any apparent source of income and without dealing with banks or bankers, was a puzzle. He must be an alchemist who possessed the secret of the transmutation of metals and the artificial creation of gold out of baser metals. For nearly a century, he consorted at the royal courts of Europe and though without any external source of income, he abounded with gold and was adorned with an array of precious diamonds and gems which were a small part of his private collection, and were the talk of all Europe. At his banquets, guests were served with announcement cards studded with diamonds of precious value. Since he traveled continually and had no landed property or inheritance (for he was not really heir to the royal house of Rakoczy as he pretended), and his origin and family were unknown, the source of his boundless wealth--in spite of his being without income and received nothing from banks --was a mystery to all, leading to the belief that he was an alchemist.

Saint-Germain was believed to be able to transmute mercury into gold, which modern scientists are now able to do by means of the cyclotron, or atom-smashing machine. If he was not able to make gold from baser metals, there would be no explanation of the source of his unlimited wealth. He was not only credited with the power of making gold but to possess a secret process by which he was able to improve the quality of diamonds and precious stones, so that they were worth many times their original value. Louis XV was particularly interested in this achievement of his, for he saw in it a way to vastly increase his wealth.

Saint-Germain's large collection of jewels and precious diamonds, according to Baron Gleichen, included an opal of monstrous size, as large as an egg. It is claimed that through his secret knowledge of chemistry that he was able to change stones that he put on the place-cards of his banquets were claimed to have been worth thousands of dollars each.

In confirmation of the current belief that Saint-Germain's wealth was self-created through alchemical processes, Casanova relates an incident in which Saint-Germain changed a twelve-sol piece into one of pure gold. When Casanova distrustfully remarked that he felt sure that Saint-Germain substituted one coin for the other, the latter replied: "Those who are capable of entertaining doubts of my work are not worthy to speak to me." And he bowed the Italian out.

Another meeting with Casanova occurred when the latter came to visit him in Belgium. He found him confined in a house which he did not leave for a considerable period of time, while engaged in chemical experiments and in the preparation of herbal elixirs. The details of this visit were as follows. On arriving in Belgium, Casanova saw some grooms walking spirited horses back and forth. He asked the groom to whom the fine animals belonged and was told: "To the Count Saint-Germain, the adept who has been here a month and never goes out. Everybody who passes through the place wants to see him, but he makes himself visible to no one."

This was sufficient to excite the curiosity of Casanova, who wrote requesting an appointment. He received the following reply: "The gravity of my occupation compels me to exclude everyone, but in your case I will make an exception. Come whenever you like, and you will be shown in. You need not mention my name nor your own. I do not ask you to share my repast, for my food is not suitable

to others, to you least of all, if your appetite is what it used to be." (This might contradict the idea that he lived without eating, though it does not prove either the reverse.)

At nine o'clock, Casanova called and found that the Count had grown a beard two inches long. When Casanova told him that he suffered from an acute disease, the Count invited him to remain for treatment, saying he would prepare fifteen pills which in three days would restore the Italian to perfect health.

It was a common belief in the eighteenth century that Saint-Germain possessed an alchemical powder which could transmute baser metals into gold. Writings of his contemporaries credit him with having accomplished the feat of transmutation on two occasions. The Marquis de Valbelle, visiting Saint-Germain in his laboratory, found the alchemist busy with his furnaces. He asked the Marquis for a silver six-franc piece, and, covering it with a black substance, exposed it to the heat of a small flame. M. de Valbelle saw the coin change color until it turned bright red. Some minutes after, when it had cooled a little, the adept took it out of the cooling vessel and returned it to the Marquis. The piece was no longer silver but of the purest gold. Transmutation had been complete. The Countess d'Adhemar had possession of this coin until 1786 when it was stolen from her secretary.

One author tells us that Saint-Germain always attributed his knowledge of occult chemistry to his sojourn in Asia. In 1755 he went to the East again for the second time. Writing to Count von Lamberg, he said: "I am indebted for my knowledge of melting jewels to my second journey to India." His skill in chemistry enabled him to prepare cosmetics which won him the favor of the ladies of the French court, the discovery of new methods of tanning and dyeing, the ennobling of precious gems, etc.

Saint-Germain's fame as an alchemist, which was believed to be the secret of his remarkable and apparently inexhaustible wealth, while without any apparent source of income, led courtiers with depleted fortunes at the court of Louis XV to envision magnificent multiplication of their gold by his aid, while grandames of uncertain age had dreams of youth restored by his fabled elixirs. He possessed and distributed the most precious and priceless gems which it was believed he had the power to make out of common stones by his secret knowledge of chemistry. Madame de Pompadour said: "This singular man passed for being fabulously rich, and he distributed diamonds and jewels with astonishing liberality."

Among those who believed in Saint-Germain's capacity as an alchemist was the Hamburg advocate Dresser, who, on October 23, 1778, wrote to Baron Uffel, judge of the Court of Appeal in Celle, both Freemasons, in the following manner about the adept he discovered:

"I must now give your Excellency news of a singular phenomenon. A man calling himself Saint-Germain, who refuses to make known his origins, is lodging here in the hotel Kaiserhof. He lives in great style...and yet he never receives any letters of credit. He writes day and night, carries on a correspondence with the greatest crowned heads, but does not care to mix in society, except that of the Countess Bentinck and the French ministers. It is very difficult to get to know him. He is an amateur in the natural sciences, has studied nature; and it is thanks to the knowledge he has received that he is now 182 years of age and looks like a man of forty. In the strictest confidence, he told a friend of mine that he possessed certain drops by which he achieves all his results; even the transmutation of metals. In his presence he transformed a copper coin into the finest silver, poor leather into the best English variety, and semi-precious stones into diamonds. At the same time, he is continually alone and by no means expansive.

"He has a superfluity of all kinds of gold and silver coins, which look as if they had just been minted... And yet he gets no remittances from anyone, nor has he any introductions to the merchants. How does all this come about? Could it be that this man is one of those whom we have been seeking?"

Thus did one Freemason write to another: "Without any encouragement of Saint-Germain, the legend of his adeptship grew. It is said that he took part in Vienna in the foundation of the Society of Asiatic Brothers and the Knights of Light, and that he was also partly responsible for the group in France known as the Philalethes, of which the Prince of Hesse, Condorcet and Cagliostro were said to be members."

Not only did Saint-Germain know the secret of the transmutation of metals, but also of increasing the size and brilliance of pearls and diamonds. Graf Karl Coblenz wrote on April 6, 1763, to Kaunitz that he admired him, when he met him at Brussels, not only for the transmutation of iron into gold, which he achieved, but also for the preparation of dyes, colors for painting and leather. Saint-Germain erected factories in which his new processes of dyeing were applied, one at Tournai for the dyeing of silk, wool and wood, and for the preparation of scentless colors, and another later in Germany with the cooperation of Prince Charles of Hesse, for the dyeing of silk and other fabrics, thus laying the foundation for the great modern industry of colored materials. The evidence for his skill in chemistry is indisputable.

In the field of medicine, he compounded a herbal elixir which he distributed gratuitously to the poor, and, by means of which, upon the testimony of Prince Charles of Hesse, he prolonged his own life. It is claimed that Mesmer derived his theory of animal magnetism from Saint-Germain, with whom he studied when the latter was in Vienna.

If Saint-Germain was once Francis Bacon, who founded Rosicrucianism and Freemasonry in England under the name of the Society of Rosicrusse Freemasons, then we may suppose that he continued to develop the work of these societies when he assumed the name of Saint-Germain, in fact, as their leader. That was exactly what he did, starting with the Rosicrucian Manifestoes which he issued under the name of Valentine Andreas in Germany while still in England under the name of Francis Bacon during the first quarter of the seventeenth century.

Manly Hall says that Saint-Germain was an important figure in the early history of Freemasonry, just as he was its founder when he was Francis Bacon, as claimed by Nicolai. This is indicated in the book, *Shakespeare, Founder of Freemasonry*, by Bacon's biographer, Dodd, who shows that the Shakespeare plays are full of Masonic symbolism and were evidently written by a Freemason, if not by the founder of Freemasonry, Francis Bacon. Dodd claims that the unknown author of the Shakespeare plays, who was Francis Bacon, purposely put into them, in cryptic form, the essential symbolism of Freemasonry, proving that their author was a Freemason and undoubtedly the founder of the order. In Mrs. Henry Pott's book, *Francis Bacon and His Secret Society*, she points out that Bacon was the founder of both Freemasonry and Rosicrucianism, which were originally a single organization, whose aims of political reform through the replacement of the institution of monarchy by the new system of democracy were hidden behind the mask of a literary society, known as that of the Rosicrusse-Freemasons.

In his *The Enigma of the Rosicrucians*, Manly Hall shows that Francis Bacon was the originator of this society, which did not antedate the sixteenth century, and was originally united with Freemasonry as the Rosicrusse Freemasons, the word "Roscircrucian" coming from the royal emblem of the House of Tudor, of which Francis Bacon, whose real name was Francis Tudor, son of Queen Elizabeth, was the last

surviving member, which was the rose and the cross.

Hall states that there were no Rosicrucians or any society by this name before Francis Bacon originated the order as a Freemasonic organization, nor can any modern society bearing the name "Rosicrucian" claim descent from any anterior fraternity. For Rosicrucianism was Francis Bacon's creation. He originated the word. It existed in its original form only so long as it was his expression; and the claims of the many Rosicrucian societies that sprang up later, claiming descent from a supposed original secret sect are not substantiated. Rosenkreutz, the legendary founder of the order, was merely one of Bacon's symbolic representations, since historically he never existed.

That Christian Rosenkreutz was a mask of Francis Bacon, its true founder, who was the author of the Rosicrucian Manifestoes, the "Confessio" and "Fama Fraternitatis," which he sent to Germany and which were published in 1615 by Valentine Andreas, a German theologian whose name he used in connection with his Rosicrucian writings, is indicated by the following statement by Wittemans, in his *History of the Rosicrucians*, who, speaking of Christian Rosenkreutz, says that he was "known in his later incarnations as Sir Francis Bacon and as Count Saint-Germain, and was the great initiator of the West. . . . He has opened the portals of initiation to the seekers for esoteric truth. As a creator of the experimental method, he has led science into quite new ways. Finally, he founded a society, Freemasonry, intended to be a parvis of the Mysteries, a school of brotherhood and tolerance. In spite of many difficulties, obstacles and partial defeats, the Order of Rosicrucians had, in large measure, accomplished its task when the French Revolution broke out. The Order of Freemasons, which had received the spiritual heritage from the Rosicrucians, counted at the end of the eighteenth century 137,375 active lodges distributed through the entire world, with about 21,300,000 members. Masonry was the only institution in that time aspiring to truth, science and justice, whence emerged in reality a new society."

That Count Saint-Germain was the secret leader of Freemasonry during the eighteenth century, continuing the work he commenced as Francis Bacon, when founder of the order, is indicated by his attending many Masonic conventions. Maags of London offered by sale a Masonic minute book in which the signatures of Count Saint-Germain and Marquis de Lafayette both appear. Many of the illustrious persons with whom the Count associated were Freemasons, as were the Founding Fathers of the American Republic, including Washington, Franklin and others. Franklin published a book on Freemasonry. Referring to his Freemasonic activities, Wittemans again writes:

"Saint-Germain had not only chosen Europe, where he resided in nearly every country, as a theater for his operations; he also went to Africa and twice to India, working for the accomplishment of a fixed plan for helping the world, which did not understand him, doing good everywhere and convincing an inexhaustible charity."

From the time that he wrote the Rosicrucian Manifestoes and issued them through Valentine Andreas in Germany in 1616, eight years before his feigned death in England and passage to the Continent, Francis Bacon was the moving spirit of Rosicrucianism during the eighteenth century, as he was its founder during the seventeenth, as well as the leader of Freemasonry. He is suspected of having been the great power behind the French Revolution, which his secret societies brought on, though intending it to lead to idealistic reformation of society and not to a Reign of Terror.

That Saint-Germain was an important figure in Freemasonry and probably the secret chief of the society is indicated by the fact that he raised Prince Charles

Alexander of Lorraine, then Governor-General of the Austrian Netherlands, the protector of Freemasonry in Belgium, to the grade of Knight of the Rose-Croix.

Saint-Germain is said to have taught his philosophy at Masonic assemblies; and by both Freemasons and Rosicrucians he was regarded as their common chief. As he was the leader of Freemasonry, so he was the moving spirit of Rosicrucianism during the eighteenth century, who strove to bring about unity among the different Rosicrucian organizations that sprang up in the eighteenth century. He was present at the Masonic Convention of Feb. 15, 1785 at Wilhelmsbad, and there endeavored to reconcile the Rosicrucians with the Illuminati, the Kabbalists and the Humanitarians. He was also in touch with the chief Rosicrucian orders in Germany and Austria at this time, particularly with the Asiatic Brothers and the Knights of Light, as well as with the Martinists of Paris and with the Templars.

In evidence that Saint-Germain, or, as he was previously called, Francis Bacon, was the true founder of Rosicrucianism, who was symbolically represented under the form of the mythical figure of Christian Rosenkreutz, is the statement in the Rosicrucian Manifestoes that he was born in 1378 and lived 106 years, which meant that he died in 1484. It is claimed that when his tomb was opened 120 years later, it was found to contain the works of Paracelsus, which is impossible, since the latter was born in 1493, and hence his writings could not have gotten into the tomb of a man who died nine years previously. This would indicate that the story of Christian Rosenkreutz was allegorical, not historical, as pointed out by Manly Hall in his *The Enigma of the Rosicrucians*, in which he points out that all attempts of modern so-called Rosicrucian societies to trace their descent to an ancient Rosicrucian order are unsupported by facts. For, as we have already indicated, Francis Bacon, last of the Tudors, whose royal insignia was the rose and the cross, was the first Rosicrucian, and the rose and the cross was his personal emblem and was never used by any secret society or occult order previously.

In the light of the above, the mysterious book that appeared at about the same time as the Rosicrucian Manifestoes, *The Chemical Wedding of Christian Rosenkreutz*, which was published by Valentine Andreas in Germany while Francis Bacon was still in England, was undoubtedly a product of Bacon's secret society. This book was first published in Strasbourgh in 1616, a year after the appearance of the Manifestoes, though Waite claims its original draft was written in 1602-3, but did not come to light until 1661, when published as a Baconian revision.

The Rosicrucian Manifestoes were a logical continuation of the work for political reform that Bacon initiated when he wrote the Shakespeare plays with the aim of destroying in the public mind the belief in the divine right of kings and the adoration of royalty and the monarchial institution, in order to psychologically prepare the world for the democratic revolution which it was the aim of his Rosicrucian-Freemasonic societies to usher in. The Manifestoes first announced publicly the ideals of the French and American Revolutions: Liberty, Fraternity and Equality, which later led to the Paris Commune and the Russian Revolution. These ideals became the cry of the French revolutionists, but unfortunately the terrorists took over and what started under the banner of idealism by Saint-Germain's secret Freemasonic Societies was converted into the bloody massacre of the Reign of Terror which he labored so long at the French court to prevent, but failed in the attempt. Thus his plans for the inauguration of a new democratic age, for which he worked for over a century, namely, to overthrow monarchy and replace it by a new political system based on the ideals of human freedom and equality, were temporarily thwarted as the Reign of Terror was followed by the Napoleonic regime; and in place of a frivolous king, there came a power-mad militarist who did not hesitate to plunge Europe into bloodshed to realize his vain ambitions.

Saint-Germain foresaw the bloody Reign of Terror and though he was the power behind the French Revolution, he tried his best to save his royal friends from suffering, since he felt a personal responsibility for the events that were to ensue. In 1774 he gave serious warnings not only to Countess d'Adhemar, the friend of Marie Antoinette, and to the Count de Maurepas, whom he called "a frivolous and incapable minister," but also directly to the Queen, predicting to her the anarchy that would lead to the overthrow of royalty. It was after his supposed death at Eckernforde in Schleswig in 1784 that he showed himself to the unfortunate Marie Antoinette and others on several occasions and was immediately recognized. He again warned Marie Antoinette in 1788, stating that the Bourbons would be swept from all the thrones, revolution was going to break out, would give place, under the ensuing dictatorship of political orators, to a debt of several billions.

On the eve of the Revolution, he showed himself to the Count de Maurepas, Minister of Louis XV, who declined to let him see the king, and to whom he made the following prophetic pronouncement:

"In opposing yourself to my seeing the monarch, you are wrecking the monarchy; for I have but a limited time to give to France, and when that is past, I shall not be seen here again until three generations have gone down to the grave. I told the Queen all that I am permitted to tell her; my revelations to the king would have been more complete...I have nothing to reproach myself with when horrible anarchy devastates France. Expect no homage from posterity, frivolous and incapable minister. You will be ranked among those who cause the ruin of empires."

Thus did Saint-Germain, the secret power behind the French Revolution, foresee and predict events that were to happen since he was in intimate touch with those who were to bring them to pass, who were the members of his secret societies which precipitated the revolution. His statement that France would not see him for three generations agrees with another prophecy he made about his disappearing from Europe early in the nineteenth century and not reappearing for 85 years, which prediction he fulfilled by his trip to Tibet, where he spent most of the nineteenth century during which he was absent from the European scene of his former operations.

Saint-Germain tried his best to save the lives of his friends, Louis XV and Marie Antoinette, from the guillotine by advising them to flee and save themselves from their fate at a time when the possibility of revolution seemed remote. His warnings, however, fell on deaf ears; and the royal couple ended their lives on the guillotine because they failed to heed it. Had Louis XV profited by Saint-Germain's prophetic warnings, the loss of his head and the Reign of Terror might have been averted.

Saint-Germain also predicted the various political and social changes that would occur in France from the time of the Revolution to the Napoleonic Era, indicating that he was well acquainted with the internal politics of this nation and of the impending storm, which he intended to be the birth-pangs of the birth of a new democratic era which his society societies worked to realize and which he hoped to make as bloodless as possible.

Marie Antoinette was much disturbed by the direful nature of Saint-Germain's prophecies and questioned Madame d'Adhemar as to her opinion of their significance. Madame replied, "They are dismaying, but certainly they cannot affect your Majesty."

Madame d'Adhemar also recounts a dramatic incident. Saint-Germain offered to meet the good lady at the Church of the Recottets about the hour of eight o'clock mass. Madame went to the appointed place in her sedan chair and recorded the following conversation between herself and the adept, who then prophesied the coming of the French Revolution as follows:

SAINT-GERMAIN: "I am Cassandra, prophet of evil, Madame, he who sows the wind reaps the whirlwind. I can do nothing. My hands are tied by a stronger power than myself."

MADAME: "Will you see the Queen?"

SAINT-GERMAIN: "No, she is doomed."

MADAME: "Doomed to what?"

SAINT-GERMAIN: "Death."

MADAME: "And you - you too?"

SAINT-GERMAIN: "Yes--like Cazotte. Return to the palace. Tell the Queen to take heed of herself, that this day will be fatal to her."

MADAME: "But M. de Lafayette?..."

SAINT-GERMAIN: "A balloon inflated with wind. Even now, they are settling what to do with him, whether he shall be an instrument or a victim. By noon all will be decided. The hour of repose is past, and the decrees of Providence must be fulfilled."

MADAME: "What do they want?"

SAINT-GERMAIN: "The complete ruin of the Bourbons. They will expel them from all thrones they occupy and in less than a century, they will return in all their different branches to the ranks of private citizens. France as a kingdom, empire and mixed government will be tormented, agitated, torn. From the hands of class tyrants, she will pass to those who are ambitious and without merit."

Madame d'Adhemar, who preserved many anecdotes of the life of this "wonder man" copied from one of Saint-Germain's letters the following prophetic verse predicting the downfall of the French empire:

"The time is fast approaching when imprudent France,
Surrounded by misfortune she might have spared herself,
Will call to mind such hell as Dante painted,
Falling shall we see sceptre, censer, scales,
Towers and escutcheons, even the white flag,
Great streams of blood are flowing in each town;
Sobs only do I hear, and exiles see.
On all sides civil discord loudly roars
And uttering cries, on all sides virtue flees
As from the Assembly votes of death arise.
Great God, who can reply to murderous judges?
And on what brows august I see the swords descend!"

The seed that Saint-Germain, as Francis Bacon, planted when he wrote the

historical Shakespeare plays with the object of preparing the public mind for the democratic revolution, and which his secret Rosicrucian and Freemasonic societies nurtured, thus came into blossoming in the political revolutions that swept through Europe, during the latter part of the eighteenth century, causing the thrones of kings to totter and the rise of modern democracy as a new political doctrine of which he was the master-mind and which his Freemasonic societies labored to realize. This achievement was the underlying motive of his whole life and varied activities in the courts of Europe. The United States of America, its Declaration of Independence and Constitution, were creations of his Masonic followers who were the founders of this nation, of which he was the true father, as he was the father of modern democracy in general. The Masonic symbols still found on the American dollar is mute evidence of the fact that Freemasonry, which order he first established, to which George Washington, Benjamin Franklin and other Founding Fathers belonged, was the power behind the American Revolution and the founding of American democracy.

Just as Francis Bacon, in his "New Atlantis" predicted in the sixteenth century the rise of a new scientific civilization and its inventions, such as the submarine, airplane, automobile, etc., so later as Saint-Germain, in the eighteenth century, he predicted the coming of steam locomotion and the steamship. Once, while holding a discussion with some Masonic followers, he suddenly left, saying he had to go to Germany to prepare for these inventions; and he also predicted his journey to the Himalayas at the beginning of the following century, and that he would remain there exactly eighty-five years. Franz Graeffner, in his *Recollections of Vienna*, recalls the incident above described as follows:

"Saint-Germain then gradually passed into a solemn mood. For a few seconds he became rigid as a statue; his eyes, which were always expressive beyond words, became dull and colorless. Presently, however, his whole being became re-animated. He made a movement with his hand as if in signal of departure, then said:

"I am leaving; do not visit me. Once again you will see me. Tomorrow night I am off. I am much needed in Constantinople; then in England, there to prepare two inventions which you will have in the next century--trains and steamboats. These will be needed in Germany. The seasons will gradually change--first the spring then the summer. It is the gradual cessation of time itself, as the announcement of the end of the cycle. I see it all. Astrologers and meteorologists know nothing, believe me. One needs to have studied the Pyramids, as I have studied. Toward the end of this century I shall disappear out of Europe and betake myself to the region of the Himalayas. I will rest. I must rest. Exactly in eighty-five years will people again set eyes on me. Farewell!"

CHAPTER FOUR

THE FEIGNED DEATH OF COUNT SAINT GERMAIN AND HIS LATER REAPPEARANCES

The last days of Saint-Germain's long life were divided between his experimental research work in alchemy while residing at the estate of his disciple, prince Charles of Hesse, and the mystery school at Louisenlung in Schleswig, where philosophical and political problems were under discussion. The following facts are known about his last days, prior to his feigned death in 1784, while staying with Prince Charles, which occurred exactly 160 years after his feigned death in England in 1624 when he was known as Francis Bacon..

The last days of his known life were divided between a stay at the home of the Margrave of Brandenburg-Anspach and that of Prince Charles of Hesse-Cassel. It was at Triesdorf that he met, and was invited by, the Margrave to lodge with him, at which time he introduced himself as a Russian general, Graf Tzarogy, which invitation he accepted on condition that he may live his own way in his own apartment, quietly and at peace. He desired no servant and dined as simply as possible in his own room which he seldom left. His needs were extremely few, and he avoided all general society. It was impossible to persuade him to dine at the Margrave's table.

One day he showed the Margrave an invitation he received from his friend, Graf Alexis Orloff, a Russian general, whom he had formerly met in St. Petersburg in 1762, during his stay in Russia under the reign of Peter III, having left there when Catherine II came to the throne. Orloff had just returned from Italy and wanted to meet him at Nurenburg, while passing through. The Margrave and Graf Tzarogy went to Nurenburg, where Orloff met him with open arms. At this time he appeared to his host for the first time in the uniform of a Russian general. Concerning this phase of his life, Butler, in her book previously referred to, says:

"The interest thus aroused in the Margrave developed into a friendly patronage which, as so often with Saint-Germain's relationships, held elements of discipleship with it. Although indefatigably experimenting with dyes and skins, and always urging those around him to do the same on the principles he laid down, and although also trying to interest his patron in the financial aspects of these experiments, he was a quiet, courteous, considerate and very retiring guest at the castle of Triesdorf, where he was given rooms on the ground floor. He would emerge in the evening to converse enchantingly and sometimes mysteriously, but would never consent to be present at the table of his host; for the diet to which he seemed to have adhered to so religiously throughout his life did not admit of meals in public. His needs were the simplest and his circumstances greatly reduced. He then went under the name of Count Tzarogy, under which that his real name was Prince Rakoczy, prior to the confession that he was the last of that royal and unhappy line.

"However, the Margrave found that this claim was not substantiated, for, during a journey to Italy the following year (1775), the Margrave was full of the story of the recluse of Triesdorf and began to put questions about Rakoczy, only to be told that all three were dead; and that the mysterious visitor was the notorious Saint-Germain, son of a tax-collector of San Germano, an adventurer and worse, fooling the world under one alias after another. The disillusioned Margrave sent Gemmingen to confront the guest on his return, but the former could

not shake him. He owned to all the aliases except Soltikov, but stuck to the story of being Rakoczy, and declared that he had adopted different names to throw off the scent the enemy pursuing him as the pretender to the Transylvania throne." (Author's note: He might have more properly said the English throne.) He also duly maintained that whatever name he had from time to time adopted, he had never disgraced any of them, Volz says:

"As long as he was connected with the Margrave, he never uttered a single wish, never received anything of the slightest value, never interfered in anything that did not concern him. With his extremely simple mode of life, his wants were very limited. When he had money, he shared it with the poor."

Saint-Germain's stay with the Margrave came to an end after the latter's return from Italy, refusing to communicate with him except through Gemmungen, and demanding his letters back. His guest surrendered all except one, which he said he had given to Orloff; and refusing the offer to stay quietly at Schwabach, he made off into the unknown.

Three years later, in 1779, Saint-Germain appeared in Schleswig to his friend, Prince Charles of Hesse-Cassel, a well-known Freemason, who became his patron and invited him to stay with him at his home at Eckernforde. Uninterested at the outset in Saint-Germain's inventions in improving the arts of dyeing, smelting, ennobling metals and purifying precious stones, he was gradually won over by his earnestness and became his pupil like Louis XV. When he first came to Schleswig, Saint-Germain said he was eighty-eight years of age, saying he was the son of Prince Rakoczy and that he had been educated in the house of the last of the Medici. Prince Charles believed him implicitly and fitted him up a factory at Eckernforde, while paying a doctor named Lossau a handsome annual income to dispense his guest's medical discoveries.

In conversation with his patron, Saint-Germain showed himself to be an avowed materialist, whose great aim was to benefit humanity. He pronounced himself an atheist, opposed Christianity and spoke in derogatory terms of Jesus; but when he realized that this distressed his friend, he promised never to touch upon the topic again.

It is claimed that he died at Eckernforde on February 27, 1784, after contracting rheumatism due to the damp rooms in which he lived there, causing his health to fail noticeably; and was buried there on the second of March, his death having been entered in the parish register. It was a great loss and grief to the Prince of Hesse-Cassel, who, in his "Memoirs," wrote:

"He was perhaps one of the greatest sages who has ever lived. He loved humanity; he desired money only in order to give to the poor. He even loved animals, and his heart was occupied only with the happiness of others. He believed he could make mankind happy by procuring for them new pleasures, lovelier cloths and colors; and glorious colors cost almost nothing. I have never known a man with a clearer mind, and at the same time he was possessed of a learning, especially in history, that I have rarely found. He had been in all the countries of Europe...but France seemed to be the land which he loved best."

The mock funeral of Francis Bacon and his departure for Germany was followed by another feigned death of this same enigmatical individual over a century and a half later, under the name of Count Saint-Germain. For while it is generally believed that Saint-Germain died on the estate of Prince Charles of Hesse-Cassel in 1784, according to Manly Hall, "The strange circumstances connected with his passing lead us to suspect that it was a mock funeral similar to that given the

English adept, Lord Bacon." This is indicated by the following report about his passing: "Great uncertainty and vagueness surround his latter days, for no confidence can be reposed in the announcement of the death of one illuminate by another, for, as is well known, all means to secure the end were in their code justifiable, and it may have been to the interests of the society that Saint-Germain should have been thought dead."

On this subject, Madame Blavatsky remarked: "Is it not absurd to suppose that if he really died at the time and place mentioned, he would have been laid in the ground without the pomp and ceremony, the official supervision, the police registration, which attend the funerals of men of his rank and notoriety? Where are these data? He passed out of public sight more than a century ago, and positive proof that he was living several years after 1784. He is said to have had a most important private conference with the Empress of Russia in 1785 or 1786 and to have appeared to the Princess of Lambelle when she stood before the Tribunal, a few moments before she was struck down with a bullet, and a butcher-boy cut off her head; and to Jeanne Dubarry, the mistress of Louis XV, as she waited on her scaffold at Paris for the stroke of the guillotine in the Days of Terror of 1793."

Though the church register at Eckernforde shows that Saint-Germain died in that town while a guest of Charles of Hesse, his protector and disciple, he was nevertheless seen by many people and in many places since, both during the nineteenth century and during the early part of the twentieth century. His presence was reported at a Masonic convention in Paris and Wilhembsbad in 1785, on the authority of distinguished historians. And in 1788, Count de Chalons declared to Countess d'Adhemar that, on returning from his embassy in Venice, he had talked with him in the Plaza of St. Mark late on the night of his departure as ambassador to Portugal.

The Countess d'Adhemar wrote in her memoirs that she had talked more than six times with the Count since 1784. The first time occurred in 1785 in Paris, at a chapel of the Franciscans, after he had written her to give her new warnings concerning the dangers that awaited the royal couple. He then repeated to her orally that the downfall of the monarchy had become inevitable; and he foretold the triumph and also the rapid fall of the Duc d'Orleans. At the end of the long conversation which she then had with him, she asked him when she would see him again. He replied, "Five times more."

This prediction was fulfilled. One year before her death, the Countess wrote, in a note dated May 12, 1821: "I have again seen Saint-Germain, and to my greatest amazement, at the death of the Queen (October 16, 1793), at the coming of the 18th Brumaire (Nov. 9, 1799), on the morning of the death of Duc d'Enghien (March 15, 1804), in the month of January, 1815, and on the eve of the murder of the Duc de Berri (1820)." This made five times that she saw him after his supposed death in 1784, just as he predicted she would. After recounting Saint-Germain's five posthumous appearances, the Countess added, "I await the sixth visit when God wills."

The Encyclopedia Britannica stated that Count Saint-Germain is said to have attended a Masonic conference several years after his death had been reported. Andrew Lang is among those who doubt that Saint-Germain really died in 1784 as officially supposed, writing: "Did Saint-Germain really die in the palace of Prince Charles of Hesse about 1780-85? Did he, on the other hand, escape from the French prison where Grosley thought he saw him during the Revolution? Was he known to Lord Lytton about 1760?... Is he the mysterious Muscovite adviser of the Dalai Lama? Who knows? He is a will-o'-the-wisp of the memoir-writers of the eighteenth century." (*Historical Mysteries*).

After his feigned death, Saint-Germain disappeared from the European stage as mysteriously as he appeared, and as he vanished from England after his feigned death in 1624, leaving behind the priceless heritage of his philosophical works and the Shakespeare plays. Nothing is known with positive certainty about where he went after he left the house of Prince Charles. Having accomplished his mission, he vanished. From the "Memoirs de Mon Temps" of Charles of Hesse, we gain certain particulars concerning the last years before the disappearance of the adept. Charles was deeply interested in occult and Masonic mysteries, and a secret society, of which he was the leading spirit, held occasional meetings on his estate. After studying fragments left by Charles, Cagliostro believed he was initiated into Egyptian Freemasonry by Saint-Germain, who attended some of these meetings, and he confided more in Charles than in others he is reported to have known. Concerning Saint-Germain's reappearances after his supposed death in 1784, Butler writes:

"If he ever said (which is doubtful) that his approaching dissolution was in reality a preparation for a forthcoming rejuvenation, he was talking more like an adept and a sage than a mystery-monger. According to Luchet (a very suspect source) his miraculous ascension was proclaimed at the moment of his burial. A journal published in 1785 declared that many still believed he was alive, and would soon appear amongst them. The Freemasons seem to have been of the same opinion, since they called him to the Conference in 1785. Madame de Genlis maintained she saw him in Vienna in 1821."

In 1845, in memoirs emanating from Vienna, more about Saint-Germain's posthumous life is related in the form of a prophecy the sage made to Franz Graffer, the author, which we have quoted before, predicting his voyage to the Himalayas and his eighty-five year residence in the Far East, which prediction, according to Madame Blavatsky, who was there at the time, was fulfilled. She was one of his most outstanding admirers. Butler believes that he was the inspiration of her Theosophy and the only real one in its Pantheon of Masters. Concerning him she wrote: "The Comte de Saint-Germain was certainly the greatest Oriental Adept Europe has seen during the last centuries." While there is no evidence that Blavatsky met him, Butler claims that it was Saint-Germain, under the figure of Lytton's Zanoni that made a powerful impress on her and influenced her future life.

But Zanoni was not the only one of Madame Blavatsky's indirect contacts with Saint-Germain. Another occurred when she traveled to Tibet in the latter part of the nineteenth century, when she heard rumors of the arrival there, earlier in the century, of an Englishman whose unusual mastery over languages made him the marvel of the lamaseries. He was known to have mastered every art and science. He joined the Brotherhood of Khelan. This probably led to Andrew Lang's question, previously quoted, as to whether he was the mysterious adviser who then appeared to the Dalai Lama. In her *Isis Unveiled*, Madame Blavatsky writes on this subject:

"Who has not heard of the Houtouktou of Higher Tibet? The Brotherhood of Khelan was famous throughout the land; and one of the most famous of the 'Brothers' was a Pehling (an Englishman) who had arrived one day during the early part of the nineteenth century from the West. He spoke every language, including Tibetan, and knew every art and science, says the tradition. His sanctity, and the phenomena produced by him, caused him to be proclaimed a Shaberon after a residence of a few years. His memory lives to the present day among the Tibetans, but his name is a secret with the Shamberons alone." (Concerning this statement by Blavatsky, Udny, author of *Later Incarnations of Francis Bacon*, says: "The name of this mysterious European (for that is what Pehling really means) need be no secret for those who know that that great man, Count Saint-Germain, went to the Himalayas."

about 1800.")

The identity of this Mysterious European visitor to Tibet during the early part of the nineteenth century with Francis Bacon and Count Saint-Germain is indicated by the fact that all three possessed unusual command over languages and 'knew every art and science.' On this point, Udry, in his *Later Incarnations of Francis Bacon*, writes:

"This alone is almost enough to identify him with Saint-Germain, of whom we read in *The Comte de Saint Germain*: 'The Count speaks French, English, Italian, Spanish, and Portuguese equally perfectly, so much so that when he converses with any of the inhabitants of the above countries in their mother tongue, they were unable to discover the slightest foreign accent.' The learned and the Oriental scholars have proved the knowledge of the Count St. Germain. The former found him more apt in the language of Homer and Virgil than themselves; with the latter he spoke Sanskrit, Chinese and Arabic in such a manner as to show them that he had some lengthy stay in Asia, and that the languages of the East were but poorly learned in the colleges of Louis the Great and Montaigne."

If Saint-Germain was alive during the nineteenth century, most of which time was spent in Tibet, where he certainly must have perfected himself in the art of rejuvenation in which Tibetan yogis and lamas are masters, certainly he should be alive, youthful and healthy in the twentieth century as well. Many hold the belief that he is still alive and some claim to have seen him, spoken to him received letters from him, or received other types of communication. Manly Hall, one of the greatest students of his biography, stated that Saint-Germain was seen at a Masonic convention in France as late as 1925; and eight years later, the head of a Co-Masonic society in San Jose, Costa Rica, told the writer that he had received a letter from him and that he was the world head of this order, coming from the Carpathian Mountains. Barbara Moore-Pataleewa, a Russian physician residing in England and a specialist in rejuvenation, claims she once met him personally, as Ninon de L'Enclos, whom he taught his secret of the preservation of youth, enabling her to look like a young woman at the age of ninety, had done previously.

There is a widespread belief among Theosophists and other occult societies that Saint-Germain is still living. Mrs. Ballard, founder of the "I Am" movement, claims to have received communications from him as the teacher of her order. The Theosophical writer, Leadbeater, in his book, *The Masters and the Path*, published in 1925, describes as follows a personal meeting with him in Rome:

"The other adept whom I had the privilege of encountering physically was the Master, the Comte de St. Germain, called sometimes Prince Rakoczy. I met him under quite ordinary circumstances (without any previous appointment, and, as though by chance) walking down the Corso in Rome, dressed just as any Italian gentleman might be (Author's note: This reminds one of his previous guise as Signor Gualdi over two hundred years previously.) He took me up into the gardens of the Pincian Hill, and we sat for more than an hour talking about the (Theosophical) Society and its work.

"Though he is not especially tall (Author's note: Correct, since both Francis Bacon and Saint-Germain were rather short in stature), he has the exquisite courtesy and dignity of a grand seigneur of the eighteenth century. We feel at once that he belongs to a very old and noble family (Author's note: The House of Tudor, as son of Queen Elizabeth). His eyes are large and brown, and are filled with tenderness and humor, though there is in them a glint of power, and the splendor of his presence impells men to make obeisance. His face is olive-tanned; his close cut brown hair is parted in the center and brushed back

from the forehead, and he has a short and pointed beard. (Author's note: as he had when Francis Bacon, though he shaved it as Saint-Germain.) Often he wears a dark uniform with facings of good lace--often also a magnificent red military cloak--and these accentuate his soldier-like appearance. (Author's note: We may recall that he appeared in the uniform of a Russian general when he met Orloff in Nurenburg.) He usually resides in an ancient castle in Eastern Europe, that belonged to his family for centuries. (Author's note: Probably in the Carpathian Mountains from where the letter was sent that the head of the Co-Masonic Society in San Jose, Costa Rica, received.)

"Master the Comte de St. Germain (was) known in history in the eighteenth century, whom we sometimes call Master Rakoczy, as the last survivor of the royal house. (Author's note: False, as this was Saint-Germain's subterfuge to conceal his identity as Prince of England.) He was Francis Bacon, Lord Verulum in the seventeenth century...He is also much concerned with the political situation in Europe and the growth of modern physical science." (Author's note: Bacon's inductive philosophy gave rise to the development of the modern scientific era in place of the medieval age which preceded it, while his Freemasonic activities, terminating in the French Revolution, gave birth to modern democracy.)

Commenting on Leadbeater's statements, E. M. Butler, in her book already referred to, says:

"It would be a hard heart indeed which could not rejoice at this apotheosis of Saint-Germain by which he has regained, and more than regained, his pristine splendor at the Court of Versailles...For indirectly he was himself very largely responsible for the Theosophical Movement. The vitality of his personality after death led to a further life in literature; for he was no other than the title-hero of Bulwer Lytton's novel *Zanoni*. This fell in Madame Blavatsky's hands fairly early in her career; it affected her profoundly, and the fact that *Zanoni* was really Saint-Germain was probably well known in the circles in which she moved. Hence her identification of the latter with one of the Adepts, since it is in this guise that Bulwer Lytton portrayed him."

If Saint-Germain is still alive, the question arises as to where he is. Could he be in the Himalayas as a member of the "Great White Lodge" of Theosophical Masters, of whom he is considered one? That would be a very dangerous place to be now in view of the heavy fallout over the entire Himalayan region produced by Russian hydrogen bomb explosions in nearby Siberia. Certainly it would be a poor way to further extend his longevity to breathe radioactively contaminated air.

There would seem to be much more logic in the claim that he has entered the Subterranean World to escape both from radioactivity and other disadvantages of the earth's surface as well as once and for all enjoy peace of mind and live without fear that his life might be endangered by some pretender to the English throne were his great secret revealed that he was a son of Queen Elizabeth and therefore a legitimate Prince of England. Now he can live in peace and no longer have to travel from place to place under assumed names. The Brazilian Theosophical Society, which has a large temple dedicated to "Agharta" (the Subterranean World) at Sao Lourenzo, Minas Gerais, Brazil, maintain that Saint-Germain is now living in the Subterranean World together with other great masters. Charles A. Marcoux, of Subsurface Research Center in Phoenix, Arizona, who has devoted twenty years to searching for an entrance to the Subterranean World, wrote to the author some time ago: "I want to comment concerning one thing that may be of interest, pertaining to Count-Germain. Such a party has contacted me on several occasions, at least he claimed to be Count Saint-Germain. As you may know, the "I Am" movement claims to have gotten all their information from Saint-Germain, which corresponds with some of my findings."

CHAPTER FIVE

DID SAINT-GERMAIN IN THE 18TH CENTURY CREATE THE DEMOCRATIC REVOLUTION, JUST AS, WHEN FRANCIS BACON, HE CREATED THE SCIENTIFIC REVOLUTION?

The interesting information contained in this chapter was supplied by a profound student of Saint-Germain, Paul Masson, an American resident in Brazil. The following will explain why Mr. Masson considers Count Saint-Germain as the mastermind behind the French Revolution, as well as the American Revolution--which gave birth to modern democracy. This great achievement was accomplished by the air of his Freemasonic and Rosicrucian societies which he founded in England when he was Francis Bacon. He wrote the Shakespeare plays to destroy in the public mind the belief in the divine right of kings and to prepare it for the Democratic Revolution which caused the thrones of Europe's kings to totter and to be replaced by republican governments.

In support of his claim that Saint-Germain "single-handedly" engineered the French Revolution, by the aid of his secret societies, though he never intended that the terrorists take over, Mr. Masson supplied the following interesting evidence in a letter to the writer on Dec. 28th, 1959, which included many other interesting facts about the great Rosicrucian adept.

Speaking about a friend he knew in France who claimed that when he went to school there was a fellow-student in his class called Comte de Saint-Germain, Mr. Masson says:

"Regarding the statement of my friend in Nice that he had a fellow-student in his class named the Comte de Saint-Germain, this struck me as very strange. Unfortunately, I could get no further information from my friend, because he knew nothing of the historical Saint-Germain whom we know. My friend was not a student of occultism, and beyond the statement he made, he could add nothing further."

"Your statement that Saint-Germain's secret societies brought on the French Revolution merely confirms the one I made about Saint-Germain's work. He was indefatigable in the creation of Masonic lodges all over Europe. His work was to liberate the human spirit from centuries of mental oppression. The Jesuits were his bitter enemies. Is it a mere coincidence that the Jesuitical Order was suppressed in 1775 and remained outlawed for the next forty years? I hold it was Saint-Germain's work. Carl Ramus says:

"Saint-Germain traveled much throughout Europe, and even made two journeys to visit the Shah of Persia. A concrete part of his work appears to have been the founding of Masonic lodges in many cities, a work far more difficult than now, and in some countries only possible through the personal favor he enjoyed in royal circles."

"Saint-Germain had a triple work to perform. The first was to work with individuals who were to be initiated in the inner mysteries according to their spiritual development, after which they would in turn help Saint-Germain. Thus Cagliostro, his most famous pupil, founded lodges of Egyptian Freemasonry. Another of Saint-Germain's pupils was said to be Friedrich Anton Mesmer; and his special work was to stimulate interest in occult medicine and mesmerism. Mesmer founded an occult society known as the "Order of Universal Harmony."

"Secondly, his work was with the intellectual class, and he did this in the most thorough manner possible by virtually creating armies of freemasons. These intelligent men, whose previous creed-incrusted minds had been magically transformed into keen men of speculative thought and logic, by the power of the Master, were the leaven which gradually transformed the entire intellectual climate of France, first giving rise to the 'Encyclopedists,' whose contributors were such famous men as Voltaire, Rousseau, Grimm, Holbach, Duclos and other famous men, and then like a veritable mental tidal wave, overwhelmed the rest of the country, to the gaping astonishment of the neighboring countries, England, Germany and Italy. The Vatican, with its tens of thousands of servile agents, found itself powerless to stem the rising intellectual tide of freedom, and found itself compelled to issue anathemas against the new order and excommunicate all those who became Freemasons. One man, if man he was, did it; and it was Saint-Germain!

"His third work, and probably the most important, was with the schools of esotericism, such as the Orders of Illuminati and the Rosicrucians. Profane history can give us no account of his activities in this field, beyond the merest guesses and speculations of those who knew nothing of the work he did. But, as his activities in this special sphere increased, there spring up spurious 'orders,' also calling themselves Rosicrucians and Illuminati (the latter being the Machiavellian creation of an obscure German professor in a small German university). His well-conceived scheme was to dangle before the Freemasons of Germany the hope of occult powers and knowledge by joining his Order. Professor Weishaupt, for that was his name, was so successful in his endeavor, far beyond his wildest dreams, that his 'adepts' numbered in the hundreds of thousands of the upper-class Germans, and to a lesser extent, in the rest of Europe. Finally, as his crowning achievement, even Frederick the Great, King of Prussia, applied for admission to his Order, to whom he made clear his stupendous scheme, which was to control Freemasonry, bring on a bloody revolution in France and then conquer the country in a bloodless coup. Frederick the Great put a stop to this colossal plan. Why? Because the King of Prussia was an initiate and a very good friend of Count Saint-Germain, a true Freemason, and kept his vows, made in all of Saint-Germain's lodges, to revere life and abide by the high moral standards which the lodges inculcated.

"The spurious occult societies exist to this very day. In 1928, I made an effort to contact the real Rosicrucian Society, when I was in the United States. In less than six months, I unearthed eight Rosicrucian societies and orders, all of them claiming to be the genuine one. I know of only two of them that are still functioning, i.e., the AMORC (Lewis Spencer's very, very spurious order), now carried on by his heirs, and the Max Heindel Rosicrucian Society. Max Heindel, by the way, was a disciple of Rudolf Steiner, the Theosophist, and broke away from his teacher to find his own order. Was Steiner a true Rosicrucian?

"I read *Comte de Gabalis* when I was a mere boy, and did not understand anything about his Sylphs, Undines and Salamanders. I learned later, however, that one must have the key in order to read the book correctly. I know an 'adept' who has this key, and who, by the way, knows more about Saint-Germain than probably anyone living in the Western World. When I meet him again, I shall ask him for more information on the subject. By the way, Bulwer Lytton's *Zanoni*, the biography of a great adept, I hold is a popular account of many of Saint-Germain's activities in the eighteenth century. Zanoni, in the book, is a high Rosicrucian adept, together with his friend and senior, the adept Mejnour. But why should Bulwer Lytton know anything about Saint-Germain that others do not know? Simply this: Lord Lytton's father founded an occult order in England and knew intimately many of the European initiates of the time. In one of his books,

The Coming Race, Bulwer Lytton mentions a subterranean country inhabited by an advanced race which can control a secret power which Bulwer calls 'Vril.' You have probably read the book. In his *Strange Story* Bulwer gives an account of a black magician who had found the secrets of mixing certain herbs which completely rejuvenate the body."

CHAPTER SIX

THE MYSTERY OF FRANCIS BACON

An Account of Saint-Germain's Early Life in England

We shall see here that Saint-Germain was not only the leader of Freemasonry and Rosicrucianism in Europe during the eighteenth century, but he was the actual founder of these Orders during the sixteenth, when he was known as Francis Bacon, before his feigned death in England and his traveling to Germany, where he wrote under the name of Valentine Andreas, and to whom he sent the Rosicrucian Manifestoes for publication some nine years before his supposed death in 1624.

Francis Bacon (under which name we shall refer to Count Saint-Germain during the rest of this book) was undoubtedly one of the greatest geniuses who lived during the past thousand years. Born at the close of the Medieval Age, which was an outgrowth of the experimental method, he originated as part of the inductive philosophy of his "Novum Organum," which revolutionized human thought.

Parallel to his contributions to science and philosophy were his stupendous literary creations under various feigned names, most famous among which was that of Shakespeare, which created the Elizabethan Renaissance in literature. And in addition, he was the founder of a new political system which we call democracy, which he ushered in through the work of his secret Freemasonic and Rosicrucian societies, which he founded and of which he was the leader. And in addition, he was an alchemical adept who possessed the secret of everlasting youth that enabled him to live on long after his contemporaries, who believed him dead, disappeared. He was then reborn, Phoenix-like, in Europe as Count Saint-Germain, to lead the secret societies he originated when he was Francis Bacon. Here are the highlights in the life-history of this Man of Mystery:

He was the son of Queen Elizabeth and her legitimate husband, Earl of Leicester, whose true name was Francis Tudor, Prince of Wales and heir to the English throne. The royal insignia of the House of Tudor, of which he was the last surviving member, was the Rose and the Cross. He used this later as a personal emblem in relation to the secret society he established, originally known as that of the Rosicrusse-Freemasons.

The above facts will explain the mysterious secrecy that Saint-Germain maintained regarding his origin and his parents. For he had a sword of Damocles hanging over his head by a thin string, for should it become known that he was a Prince of England, his life would be endangered by aspirants for the throne who would prefer to see him out of the way.

His mother, Queen Elizabeth, turned him over to Lady Bacon, after he was born, in place of her own infant who died; and he was raised as her own child and called Francis Bacon, later Francis Viscount St. Alban.

He wrote the Shakespeare plays while a young struggling lawyer, which brought him a revenue he badly needed. He was the genius who created most outstanding literary masterpieces of the Elizabethan period; and it was he who gave the English language its present form through his chief works, the plays he wrote which appeared under the name of Shakespeare, and the King James translation of the Bible, which he edited.

Regarding his editing the translations of the King James version of the Bible in 1616, after fifty-four learned men prepared them, he was commissioned by James to do this job, which he did to perfection, putting these translations together and editing them in his own matchless style.

In addition to the Shakespeare plays, he also wrote the plays of Christopher Marlowe, which many authorities have suspected to have a common authorship and some drew the erroneous conclusion that Marlowe wrote the plays of Shakespeare. Among his other anonymous literature productions were Spenser's "Fairie Queen," Montaigne's "Essays," Burton's "Anatomy of Melancholy" and Cervantes' "Don Quixote."

He founded Freemasonry and Rosicrucianism as secret societies for political and religious reform. After his feigned death in England in 1626, at the age of 65, like other Illuminated Brothers, he reappeared in another part of the world (Germany), where he continued his work for humanity under a new name (Valentine Andreas). In a rare print by Valentine Andreas, published twenty years after his burial as Bacon, he is depicted with a long beard at the age of 80; in place of the goatee he wore in England. (Later as Count Saint-Germain he was beardless.) His burial place in England was never found. Under the name of Valentine Andreas, he wrote the Rosicrucian Manifestoes which he secretly sent to Germany to be published there in 1615, nine years before his feigned death and departure for the continent. When he reached there, he continued to issue his writings under the same name. He was the mythical Christian Rosenkreutz, the supposed founder of Rosicrucianism.

From Germany he traveled to western Europe as the "Polish Rider," a painting of whom is still preserved in a New York art collection, and who, in 1670, delivered to Abbe Monfaucon de Villars certain occult discourses which were subsequently published in 1742 under the name of "Comte de Gabalis."

He later used the name of the devout Prince Francis Rakoczy of the royal house of Transylvania, who underwent a feigned death in 1735, and who was, of course, a distinct individual. In the latter part of the seventeenth century, Bacon appeared in Venice as Signor Gualdi; and in 1710 again as Count Saint-Germain, which name he retained throughout this century, though using other names as well, as the occasion required.

On February 27, 1784, he went through another feigned death at Eckernförde, under the name of Count Saint-Germain while visiting his disciple and friend, Prince Charles of Hesse-Cassel. As in the case of his burial as Francis Bacon, his grave was later found to be empty. A year later, in 1785, he was seen attending a Masonic conference. Later, in 1821, Countess d'Adhemar saw him in Vienna prior to his departure for Tibet, where he spent most of the nineteenth century. He later returned and was seen as late as 1925 at a Masonic convention in France, according to his biographer and admirer, Manly Hall.

Sir Francis Bacon, Baron of Verulam, Viscount of St. Albans, Lord High Chancellor of England, was the legitimate child of a secret marriage of Queen Elizabeth and her favorite, Robert Dudley, Earl of Leicester. His younger brother was the ill-fated Earl of Essex, Robert Devereux, whose ambitions to the crown were founded on more than vain pretense. Bacon's father, the Earl of Leicester, was poisoned, if not with the consent, at least with the knowledge of his wife, Queen Elizabeth. The true name of Francis Bacon, therefore, was Francis Tudor, Prince of Wales, and the legitimate heir to the crown of England.

One of the most informative works on Bacon's parentage is a book by Alfred Dodd entitled, *The Marriage of Elizabeth Tudor*. Being an exhaustive inquiry into her alleged marriage with the Earl of Leicester and the Births of her Two Sons,

Francis Bacon and the Earl of Essex; An historical research based on one of the themes in 'Shakespeare's Sonnets'."

Writing on the relation of "The Virgin Queen" who was "a secret wife and mother" and "Francis Bacon, the last of the Tudors," Dodd writes: "The fact of Francis Bacon's parentage--the legitimate son of Queen Elizabeth and therefore the legal heir to the Throne--is indubitable, supported as it is, not only by a mass of circumstantial evidence but by such direct testimony as Leicester's letter to Phillip of Spain, which Mme. Devente von Kunow discovered among the Spanish State Archives, begging Phillip to use his influence with the Queen Elizabeth to secure his public acknowledgement as Prince Consort."

Dodd found the story of Bacon's parentage concealed in the Shakespeare Sonnets, which have been especially rearranged in an unnatural order, but when they are properly arranged in their correct sequence, the acrostic message of Bacon's royal ancestry is clearly revealed. On this subject, Dodd writes:

"I was given to understand that the Sonnets constitute a Diary of Emotion--touching many themes--the writer being Francis Bacon. Some of the themes dealt with state matters and royal secrets. They were therefore issued under a pen name to veil his identity: William Shake-speare. The Sonnets were mixed according to a definite plan, and I was shown the correct order. There was purposeful confusion to save their suppression by the Censor, their true meaning being obscured.

"The most startling revelation was the assertion that Francis Bacon was the concealed son of Queen Elizabeth Tudor, who had been privately married to Robert Dudley, Earl of Leicester and by him had two sons, known to history as Francis Bacon and the Earl of Essex, the younger son. Readers of the appended Sonnets will find several cantos written by the eldest concealed son craving for royal recognition from his mother, the Queen. The story is told also of the tragedy of Sussex and the part played by the principles: the mother and her two sons."

Mrs. E. Gallup, in her "Bi-lateral Cypher of Francis Bacon," says that Elizabeth married Robert, Earl of Leicester, and had two sons, Francis Tudor, named Francis Bacon, and Robert Earl of Essex, who tried to get rid of his mother, Elizabeth, and become King of England, for which reason she executed him.

When Francis Bacon discovered the conspiracy that was being wrought against his father, who was poisoned with his mother's knowledge and consent, and also against his brother Essex, by his own mother, Elizabeth, under the influence of Cecil, his respect for her was destroyed, and her previous regard for him turned into bitter hatred; and hence forth she refused to recognize his abilities and literary genius, which immortalized her name in the history of literature because of the works produced during her reign.

There is a remarkable resemblance between the pictures of Francis Bacon and his brother Earl of Essex, and of both of them to their father, Earl of Leicester. Their pictures also show a marked resemblance to their mother, Queen Elizabeth. On the other hand, there is no resemblance between the physiognomy of Francis Bacon and that of Lord and Lady Bacon, his foster-parents.

In Alfred Mudie's *The Self-Named William Shake-Speare*, it was stated that when Queen Elizabeth was only a princess, she was imprisoned in the Tower by her sister, Queen Mary, at the same time as her favorite, Robert Dudley, later Earl of Leicester, was also imprisoned, in 1559. She is said to have secretly married Dudley in the house of Lord Pembroke, after the death of Dudley's wife, Amy

Robsart. The children born of this marriage were Francis Tudor, called Francis Bacon because given to Lady Bacon after birth and raised by her, and the Earl of Essex.

Queen Elizabeth had threatened Francis' death if he ever divulged the fact of his being her son, which she had angrily confessed to him when he had greatly displeased her. He was then about fourteen years of age, and all the witnesses of the Earl of Leicester's secret marriage with her were dead, and all demonstrating papers had been destroyed.

It was the intention of the queen to dispose of the child, Francis, but the entreaties of her faithful councilor, Sir Nicholas Bacon, caused her to deflect from this course. Since, at the time of Francis' birth, Lady Anne Bacon was also confined, but with a child who was born dead, Francis was substituted for Anne's dead son and was raised by her without knowledge of his true parentage.

Francis Bacon was therefore the adopted name of Francis Tudor, son of Queen Elizabeth, who was raised by Lady Bacon as her own son. While Elizabeth had much affection for the child, she was forced by her position to conceal her interest lest this awaken suspicion that could cause the life of her child to be endangered by rival aspirants for the throne, in case it became known that he was really a Prince of England.

There exists in the British Museum an engraving depicting the confinement of Queen Elizabeth. As was customary at a royal birth, the entire court was present, but they were bound to secrecy concerning the event on pain of death. This was kept as a state secret. Later Francis Bacon discovered it, but he too feared to openly express this secret, though, as Dodd so convincingly shows, he concealed it in Shakespeare Sonnets which he wrote.

The Queen and the Earl of Leicester were married privately four months prior to the birth of their child. At the age of fifteen, Francis accidentally learned the secret of his birth and was sent to France in the entourage of the French court. He then visited the very scenes which he later immortalized in the Shakespeare plays during his trip to Spain and Italy, visiting Verona, Padua and Florence. While at the French court, he fell in love with Marguerite of Navarre who was then taking steps to be divorced from her husband; and to the end of his life, he bitterly regretted the loss. He later wrote "Romeo and Juliet" as an autobiography of this experience, just as "Hamlet" (the philosopher-prince) was equally autobiographical.

Under no conditions would the Queen be induced to acknowledge Francis publicly as her son and heir to the throne, and all such attempts failed. According to unofficial reports, he was compelled to keep the knowledge a secret at the peril of his life and to swear that he would make no claim to the throne.

The Queen's intimacy with Leicester resulted in another child known to history as the Earl of Essex. The two men knew each other as brothers; and an examination of their photographs shows a marked resemblance to each other and also to their father, Earl of Leicester. (On the other hand, there is no resemblance between the physiognomy of Francis Bacon and that of Lord or Lady Bacon, his foster-parents. But between the pictures of Bacon and his mother, Queen Elizabeth, there is a strong resemblance also.)

The two heirs of the throne agreed between them that if ever Essex should be acknowledged King of England, Francis should have a free hand to devote himself to his literary and philosophical activities and ideals. When Essex was condemned for treason, Francis had no fear that his brother would actually go to

the block. The Queen had promised that if Essex would return her ring, which he had in his possession, she would refuse to sign the death warrant. But the ring did not come. The ministers pressed the Queen for her signature. As a matter of fact, Essex had sent the ring, relying on the Queen's promise; but the Countess of Nottingham kept it back, and so caused the death of Elizabeth's son. On her death bed, the Countess sent for the Queen and confessed her guilt. It is a matter of record that the horrified and enraged Queen shook the dying woman on her bed, screaming at her: "God may forgive you, but I never can." For historians to declare that Essex was the Queen's lover is absurd. All the facts point to this: That the love of Elizabeth for Essex was that of a mother for a spoiled child. False pride on the part of each led to tragedy in their lives. Elizabeth signed the death warrant for Essex, and her son was executed for treason. When Elizabeth realized the error of her actions, she collapsed and died shortly afterwards from grief.

The tragic significance of the celebrated case of treason brought by the crown against the Earl of Essex becomes more understandable when we realize that Elizabeth forced Francis Bacon to prosecute his own brother, her son. Bacon never would have consented to do this had he not been given the most solemn assurance that Essex would be pardoned in the end.

He did not like the job of having to prosecute Essex, but he did so because he believed his mother, the Queen, would refuse to sign the death warrant, for his brother. But he misjudged. She did. His brother was executed by the order of his mother! This perfidy Bacon added to his list of injuries, the record of which he incorporated in his secret cipher story hidden in his Shakesperian writings. When he discovered the conspiracy that was being wrought against him, his brother and his father by Elizabeth, under the influence of Cecil, his respect for his mother was destroyed, and her regard for him was turned to bitter hatred, and henceforth she refused to recognize his abilities.

Queen Elizabeth had a violent temper and in one of her fits of rage, she inadvertently revealed to Bacon the truth about his royal parentage, the knowledge of which altered the entire course of his life. He believed that before her death Elizabeth would acknowledge him; and it was with this hope that he aspired to the hand of Princess Marguerite of Navarre.

From his earliest years, Bacon was in frequent contact with the Elizabethan Court and with his mother, Queen Elizabeth. She is known to have had a special fondness for the child, whom she affectionately called her "little Lord Keeper." As a young boy, Bacon exhibited unusual intellectual precocity, and when yet in his early teens, had a thorough grasp of classical and modern literature in various languages, and evinced an interest in the drama and stage. A masque which he had written was performed before the queen and her court by a company of youthful players under Bacon's leadership. Later, as a young lawyer, he performed the masques he wrote, which was then a common practice for his colleagues to do, at Gray's Inn, where Shakespeare's troupe also had a performance. The two men met, made an agreement, and henceforth Bacon's dramatic writings were turned over to Shakespeare, to be performed by him under his own name, while Bacon, a struggling young lawyer who was then in financial straits, was given a badly needed royalty from the plays he wrote, which Shakespeare acted.

Bacon was educated at Oxford. By his sixteenth year, he became so dissatisfied with the scholastic doctrines of this institution that he requested that he be removed on the grounds that there was nothing further that the university could teach him. He was the cause of constant embarrassment and bewilderment to his professors who found it impossible to cope with his brilliant intellect.

Almost immediately after he left Oxford, Bacon was attached to the suite of the ambassador to France and resided some time on the continent. As we have mentioned above, it was during this time that he developed an infatuation for the Princess Marguerite of Navarre. The policies of state prevented the marriage, and Bacon, broken-hearted, returned to England. Though he later married, Marguerite remained to the end the one great love of his life.

Finding life of a courtier unbearable, Bacon established himself at Gray's Inn at London, and set himself up as a lawyer. Although possessed of legal brilliance, he had great difficulty to secure patronage and recognition, and years of struggle followed, as if fate conspired to force obscurity upon him. Though idealized by Elizabeth as a child, he was ignored by her when he grew up, though for many years, for some mysterious reason the world failed to understand, he was a "Queen's pensioner" and lived on an income received from Elizabeth. It was not until his mother's death in 1603 that his fortunes improved, and he was permitted to advance to his rightful position in the English court.

During these years of obscurity, Bacon spent much time on the study of law, in which he became a recognized authority, publishing a number of legal tracts and laying the foundation for our present system of legal jurisprudence. He also devoted himself to literary work, writing the Shakespeare plays with a view to introducing his ideas in a form appealing to the masses, while to scholars he presented his ideas in philosophical works, his first printed book of this type, the *Essays*, being still regarded as one of the great books of English literature.

When James I ascended the throne, Bacon received the advancement he justly deserved. He was first knighted, then given the Barony of Verulam and finally was created Viscount St. Albans. He reached the peak of his public career when he was named Chancellor of England, the highest honor that could be conferred on him by the king. As Lord Chancellor, Bacon became what destiny had originally ordained him to be, but which his mother prevented, the virtual ruler of England and the most powerful man in the realm.

During these years of political advancement, many of his most learned works flowed from his pen, including the *Advancement of Learning* and his masterpiece, *Novum Organum*, a new instrument of reason which made possible the birth of modern science, invention and civilization. These works revolutionized human thought and won for Bacon the justly earned title of "the father of modern science." He was regarded as a reborn Plato in whom all learning was complete; and the excellence of his literary style was matched by the brilliance of his scholarship and erudition. Even the records of his court pleadings and miscellaneous legal papers possessed unexcelled literary style. His prose was poetic, each word carefully chosen and every phrase beautifully rounded. It was in tribute to his literary skill that King James translation of the Bible when this was delivered to him by the translators.

During this period of political prominence, Bacon found his opportunity to practically realize his dream of an utopian commonwealth in America, where he hoped to establish a new system of government, different from the monarchial one of which he was then the head, and based on the principles of democracy, of which idea he was the originator and propagator, which he sought to accomplish through the secret societies of Freemasonry which he organized and of which he was the leader. Bacon initiated various colonization groups that went to the New World to establish there his scheme of a New Civilization based on the ideals of his *New Atlantis*. On this subject, Manly Hall remarks: "Among his numerous activities, Lord Bacon was responsible for the distribution of land grants in the new world of America. It was his task to divide this territory among certain

noble families of England.

The *New Atlantis*, one of the most idealistic fragments of his writings, is believed to have been inspired by his vision of the opportunities of the New World. Here the Platonic empire of the philosophic elect could be re-established and men could live together in a camaraderie of knowledge. "Among those who went forth to the New World to establish colonies of the realized New Atlantis was Bacon's own son, who led a colonization group to Virginia, where he achieved prominence as a leader in this field.

At an early age, Francis became imbued with the New Learning then spreading from Greece to Italy and France. He then conceived the idea of teaching to the common people, through the medium of the drama, the cardinal virtues in great epics of moral passion similar in principle to the way truths were presented to the masses in myths, which embodied the wisdom of the ancients. And while he wrote for the masses the plays that bore the name of Shakespeare, at the same time he created the immortal philosophical works that inaugurated a new era in human thought, which bore the name of Francis Bacon. Thus he lived a double life as a dramatist under a pen name and a philosopher under his real name, though even this was not real, for his true name was Francis Tudor, Prince of Wales, last in the line of Tudors, the royal house of England, who was the rightful heir to the English throne.

In Elizabethan days, the language of culture was Latin. There was virtually no English language save barbarous country dialects. The customs and manners of the people were rude and coarse, Francis Bacon set upon himself to accomplish the Herculean task of giving England a language, building up a vocabulary and refining the ethical standards of the masses. He spent all the money he could make in his profession as a lawyer to further his humanitarian aims, as did also Lady Bacon, his foster-mother and Anthony Bacon, his foster-brother, who were fired with the same ideals. This hidden work was that of the secret societies of fraternities he established among his friends and followers.

Thus Bacon played to perfection at the same time the role of a philosopher, a political ruler (as Lord Chancellor), a great scientist and a literary genius, which won for him the title of "the noblest birth of time." But it was inevitable that so brilliant and humanitarian a man should have many enemies, and persons envious of him, especially in a day of treasons and stratagems. Indeed it would have been a miracle if he escaped persecution, even though at this time he was considered as the straightest man in the House of Commons by all the Free-holders of England.

At James' first parliament, he was returned by two constituencies, always a rare honor. It was a tribute to his virtue and ability, which were universally recognized. At fifty-one he was made Attorney-General, and then successively, Lord Keeper, Lord Chancellor, and a Peer of the Realm. He held the office of Lord Keeper for three years, and at the age of sixty he was created Viscount St. Alban. Yet within three years after receiving this honor, England's greatest Chancellor fell--a catastrophe so surprisingly dramatic that its equal can only be found in the Shakespearian tragedies.

It is a tangled tale of the deceit, hypocrisy and corruption rampant in the Court. Lord St. Alban was falsely accused of taking bribes and perverting Justice in the Chancery Division by his political enemies who wanted to get rid of him, who covetted his position and who despised his uprightness and intellectual genius. Bacon was so taken aback by this plot against him that his health was broken as a result. (However, he later recovered.)

The result was the famous bribery trial in which the Lord Chancellor's power was broken. He was found guilty by a jury of his peers, or, more correctly, by a jury of jealous men who feared his power. Yet until this trial, Bacon's record showed him to be a model of honesty; and the *Encyclopedia Britannica*, summing up the case, states definitely that a review of Bacon's entire legal career does not indicate that any decision which he ever made was influenced by personal motives or personal advantage, and his decisions could be sustained by any modern court of law as just and equitable, and brilliantly arrived at.

The court that convicted Bacon stripped him of his estates and honors, but these were restored to him by the king himself, who also forgave the fines imposed by the court. It has been said that he never again sat in Parliament, but this is disputed. During the latter years of his life in England, he was called back on at least one occasion when his judgment and knowledge were considered necessary for the preservation of the State.

Enjoying the respect of his kind and honored throughout Europe for his scholarship, Bacon retired to his estate at Gorhambury and devoted the remainder of his known life to scientific and literary pursuits. King James declared in a letter to Bacon that as great as were his services to the State, his benefits to mankind have been still greater. It was indeed fortunate that he retired from politics to have more time to complete his priceless contributions to human knowledge.

When the false accusations of bribery were brought against him, Bacon prepared his defense. The King, full of fear of ruin and revolution, begged him to plead guilty lest the Throne be jeopardized, and finally commanded him to enter a plea of *guilty*. Bacon submitted. To humiliate him, Bacon's enemies demanded that he plead guilty to each particular charge leveled against him. As there was no way of escape, he could not draw back. The truth is that Lord St. Alban pleaded guilty to technical carelessness only, not to crime; carelessness, too, when he was new to the office, his registrars, his secretaries and his clerks.

After his fall, Bacon's enemies took over power. Dissatisfied suitors were encouraged to secure a reversal of his judgments, and attempts were made to set aside his verdicts, though not one was reversed, and they stand sound in law and in fact today as they did originally. That alone should acquit Bacon from the common verdict passed by elementary history books.

A ruined man, socially and politically, and in financial reverses, Bacon turned to his literary work. Within five years he turned out work after work of prose, philosophy and numerous secret works that appeared under assumed names. He compiled the Shakespearian Folio and published it secretly so that it should not be tarnished by his personal disgrace. He also completed his personal poems, *Shakespeare's Sonnets*, which contain the secret of his true personality, his royal birth, and the unknown history of his life. These sonnets were first sold only to the Brothers of the Masonic and Rosicrucian orders, of which he was founder and leader. He requested the Brothers not to divulge the secrets of his birth, life and death. Ben Jonson believed in his innocence. A note is extant of Bacon's interview with the King in which Bacon declares that he is ready to make an oblation of himself for the King. It is believed that he assumed the name Shakespeare as a penname taken from the Goddess Pallas Athene--the Shaker of the Spear of Knowledge at the Serpent of Ignorance--but it is more probable that the name was derived from the actor to whom he turned over his plays for their production and under whose name they appeared.

Francis Bacon played an important role in many other activities. He was the

founder of the Royal Society for Science. He was deeply interested in the colonization of the New World. It is due to him that the Atlantic seaboard was English rather than French or Spanish. He influenced profoundly English prose through his *Essays*, English philosophy through his philosophical books, including *The New Atlantis*, *Novum Organum*, *The Advancement of Learning*, etc., and English literature through his various literary creations that appeared under the names of Marlowe, Shakespeare and others. He organized the Rosicrosse Literary Society that helped him in all his literary undertakings, "his literary compeers by night," which handled the publication of his works under the names of Shakespeare and operated their own printing press, which used as its seal the double letters A, which we find hidden in the frontpieces of various Shakespearian works that it published. It is interesting to note that similar pictorial symbols appear in front of the King James translation of the Bible and the first Folio of the Shakespearian plays, indicating a common Baconian authorship.

Concerning Francis Bacon as the founder of the Royal Society, I. D'Israeli's "Second Series of Curiosities of Literature and Sacred History" says that Francis Bacon founded the Royal Society, which was in working order before the Charter was granted by Charles I. A history of the Royal Society by two of its officials says it began in 1616, the year of Shakespeare's death. It is interesting to note that the Royal Society refuses to allow a perusal of some of its papers, and the place where the Rawley Manuscripts are kept is a secret, also the place and circumstances of Bacon's death and burial place are unknown generally.

No nobler humanitarian has blessed mankind with his gifts during the past two thousand years than Francis Bacon, yet no man has been more misunderstood and slandered. Pope called him the "greatest, wisest and meanest of mankind"--but how could the greatest and wisest also be the meanest? It is claimed that he was ungrateful to his brother, Essex, by persecuting him for treason, but he was ordered by Elizabeth to do this, in spite of his entreaties to be relieved. The Queen insisted, and assigned to him in the first trial--despite his protests and pleading in Essex's behalf--that part of the arraignment which had to do with Essex's followers hiring players to play the Shakespeare play of Richard II, which infuriated Elizabeth, who regarded it as seditious, and she wanted to find out who was the real author. If Bacon refused to perform an official duty, he would have been forced to admit his own part in the conspiracy, confess his authorship of Richard II and the other Plays, and go to the block with Essex. This would not help Essex, his brother, for whose life he pleaded with the Queen, his mother.

Next it was claimed he accepted bribery, confessed to it and was convicted of bartering out justice for money. There is evidence that some of his subordinates accepted bribes, but he distinctly denies that he accepted any, or received any. The reason for his downfall was an unscrupulous man named Buckingham, the King's favorite, who saw an opportunity to sell Bacon's position to the highest bidder, and so prevailed on the king to depose him. Not to plead guilty might have meant imprisonment and perhaps the block.

Says Donnelly, in *The Great Cryptogram*, "He bowed his neck to the storm which he could neither avert nor control; biding his time, he took his secret appeal to 'foreign nations, the next ages and to his own countrymen after some time be passed. And he turned patiently away, with the burden of a great injustice and a mighty sorrow upon him, and devoted the last five years of his life to putting forth in works unequalled since the globe first rolled on its axis."

Denied his rightful kingdom--England--though a legitimate heir to the crown, Bacon resolved to build an empire of his own, the New Atlantis, a new civilization to arise on the American continent. In this book he described his ideal civilization which he hoped to create, which would be free from the intrigues and

corruption of English royalty, and would be founded on liberty, equality and fraternity, and on the rule of a society of wise men and philosophers. To achieve this goal, Bacon founded Freemasonry, whose object it was to destroy the very monarchy to whose accession he was denied, and to replace it by a democratic system of government. Through his secret societies, Bacon (who later appeared in Europe as Count Saint-Germain) created the ideals of the French Revolution (which were destroyed by the Reign of Terror), but in America his Masonic societies were more successful in instituting a new system of democratic government and a new civilization which was an attempt to put into practice Bacon's sociological philosophy which he previously outlined in his *New Atlantis*. Not only did Bacon send his son to Virginia as a leader to establish his father's Ideal Commonwealth in the New World, but there is reason to believe that Bacon himself came later. (Was he the mysterious "Philosopher" who was friend and teacher to George Washington and Benjamin Franklin, both Freemasons and Rosicrucians, who was the designer of the American flag; and was he the Mystery Man who suddenly appeared in Independence Hall on July 4, 1776, when he delivered an oration that encouraged the fearful men there present to sign the Declaration of Independence?)

Bacon was resolved that in America he would create a new civilization free from the corruption of monarchial England; and he resolved to dedicate his life to this goal. He first prepared peoples' minds for the democratic revolution through the historical Shakespeare plays he wrote, which belittled and ridiculed the institution of monarchy and belief in the divine right of kings, while in his *New Atlantis* he presented his vision and plan of a new civilization ruled by scientists and sages, which ideal he hoped to realize in America. Writing on the subject of Bacon's unjust treatment by his mother, Elizabeth, and his resolve to avenge himself by abolishing monarchy and replacing it by a new political institution, now called democracy, to be established on the American continent in whose colonization he was so much interested, Manly Hall, in his *Francis Bacon, the Concealed Poet*, says:

"His youthful mind, saddened and outraged by the injustice of which he was the victim, took on a certain bitterness and melancholy. He resolved to dedicate his life to several purposes grounded in his own affairs. First, if he could not gain his crown, he would build an empire of his own, an empire of secret learning that should ultimately confound the corruptions of the great. Second, the true story of his life should not perish, but should be preserved to posterity as a human document and as a witness to his real estate. Third, he would discover devious means to prick the consciences of those responsible for the murder of his father (Earl of Leicester) and the tragedy which overtook his own life." (The "human document" to which Manly Hall refers is the cipher story hidden in the Shakespeare plays and sonnets, which will be described below.)

Disappointment, bitterness and sadness turned Bacon, a child of royalty, to realize the sufferings of others, and to devote his life to humanitarian reform for the improvement of mankind, and to overcome the corruption of English monarchy, to which goal he dedicated his historical Shakespeare plays. In philosophy and learning, Bacon found a solace for the sorrows of his life, which, free from dissipations, was dedicated, like a true king, to the welfare of his people and of all humanity. A king he was born, and a king he was resolved to live and die, whether recognized as such or not. He desired to be remembered not by his birth, but by his merit and the good he did for the human race and by his personal accomplishments in literature, science, philosophy and political reform.

Denied his right to become King of England, Bacon plunged into learning and became a living repository of learning. Says Manly Hall:

"He saw himself a man of destiny. In creating his kingdom upon Mount Parnassus, Bacon drew about himself many of the most brilliant minds of his time. These men, knowing the truth, were his willing servants and instruments, not because they respected his royal birth, but because they respected even more his exceptional qualities. Thus, even at Gray's Inn, he held court, and here he later laid the plans for his secret society and his philosophical empire, an empire of dreamers, creators, artists, poets and scholars."

"Bacon corresponded with the best thinkers of his day in other countries, and everywhere he was acknowledged as the intellectual leader of his time. He was the head and inspirer of a society of writers who, under him, created all that was great in Elizabethan literature, the best of which was written either by himself (under the assumed name of some lesser writer (as Christopher Marlowe), or even an actor (as was the case with Shakespeare) or by others working under his direction and inspiration. It was this secret group that published the original editions of Bacon's library, manuscripts and the debris of his literary workshop, which included the original drafts of the Shakespeare plays, which to date never were discovered."

CHAPTER SEVEN

Francis Bacon was undoubtedly the greatest genius that the modern world has ever known. Our indebtedness to this great benefactor of humanity cannot be overestimated. While it is generally admitted that he ushered in the modern scientific age, his secret work of political reform that led to the birth of democracy and the downfall of monarchy is not so generally known, nor his literary achievements under the name of Shakespeare and other masks he used.

To him we owe all that differentiates the present scientific and democratic age from the medieval, monarchial one that preceded it. He not only prophesied the coming of most of our inventions--the steamboat, steam engine, airplane, submarine, etc., in his *New Atlantis* but, in his *Novum Organum*, he gave to mankind the inductive, experimental method of research by which modern science and invention became possible.

All that we denote by the words "progress" and "civilization" today we owe to him. He first turned the minds of speculative thinkers, formerly occupied with scholastic disputes, to the empirical study of nature and to control over her forces for the good of mankind. Two words form the key of his philosophy--utility and progress--said Macaulay. He sought the "multiplying of human enjoyments and the mitigation of human sufferings." The aim of this great humanitarian was "the relief of man's estate." Macaulay writes:

"Ask a follower of Bacon what the new philosophy has effected for mankind, and his answer is ready: 'It has lengthened life; it has mitigated pain; it has extinguished diseases; it has increased the fertility of the soil; it has given new security to the mariner; it has furnished new arms to the warrior; it has spanned rivers and estuaries with bridges of forms unknown to our fathers; it has guided the thunderbolt innocuously from heaven to earth; it has lighted up the night with the splendor of the day; it has extended the span of human vision; it has multiplied the power of the human muscle; it has accelerated motion; it has annihilated distance; it has facilitated intercourse, correspondence, all friendly offices, all dispatch of business; it has enabled man to descend to the depths of the sea, to soar into the air, to penetrate securely into the noxious recesses of the earth, to traverse the land with cars that whirl along without horses, and the ocean with ships which sail against the wind."

In short, Bacon ushered in a new age; he brought the medieval age to a close and brought into being the modern age of science, which he intended for the benefit of humanity. Before his time, philosophy was an abstract quest for truth; it disdained to be useful and preferred to be stationary. But Bacon's practical inductive philosophy turned human powers of perception and understanding to external nature, to the mastery of the forces of nature for the good of man.

Taine says of Bacon: "When he wished to describe the efficacious nature of his philosophy by a tale, he delineated in *The New Atlantis*, with a poet's boldness and the precision of a seer, almost employing the very terms in use now, modern applications, and the present organization of the sciences, academies, observatories, air-balloons, submarine vessels, the improvement of land, the transmutation of species, regenerations, the discovery of remedies, the preservation of food."

Donnelly speaks of "the great conflagration of science, kindled by his torch," and adds: "How grandly does he prefigure the station which he will

occupy in the judgment of posterity when he says that the man who shall kindle that light "would be the benefactor indeed of the human race, the propagator of man's empire over the universe, the champion of liberty, the conqueror and subduer of necessities."

"He tried to hurry up civilization. He sought to use the royal power to give the seventeenth century the blessings of the nineteenth...His heart thirsted for the good of mankind. He saw in his mind's eye things akin to the marvels of steam and electricity." He foresaw airships, submarines, lifepreservers, the telephone, microphone, patent-rights, quarantine, the microscope; he anticipated Roemer's discovery of time being required for the propagation of light, Newton's law of gravitation and Darwin's variation of the species. Nicolai claims Bacon was the founder of Freemasonry.

No man ever lived upon earth who had nobler aims than Francis Bacon. He stands at the portal of the opening civilization of modern times, a sublime figure--his heart full of love for mankind, his busy brain teeming with devices for the benefit of man; the most far-extending human work ever set afoot on the planet. He said: "I am a servant of posterity; for these things require some ages for the ripening of them," adding: "Always desiring, with extreme fervency, to have that which was never yet attempted, now to be not attempted in vain, to wit: to release men out of their necessities and miseries." Macaulay said: "The end which Bacon proposed for himself was the multiplying of human enjoyments and the mitigation of human sufferings...This was the object of his speculations in every department of science--in natural philosophy, in legislation, in politics, in morals."

Francis Bacon was not only the greatest figure in the history of modern philosophy and science, but also in English literature, for it was he who was the fountain-head of the Elizabethan Renaissance through his writings which appeared under the name of Shakespeare and other pen names he assumed, as Christopher Marlowe, etc.

But what is less known was his secret work for political reform, which gave to the modern world the ideals of Liberty, Equality and Fraternity, which inspired the American, French and Russian Revolutions and the Declaration of Independence, after he first prepared the public mind for the democratic revolution by destroying the belief in the Divine Right of Kings, which he did by the historical Shakespeare plays he wrote, in which he depicted kings as only human and often worse than human.

Bacon was not, however, a mere dreamer and theorist, but was also a man of action. He was not content to play the role of a prophet, as he did when he wrote his *New Atlantis*, describing a future scientific civilization to arise a few centuries later; but he wished to realize his Utopian dream on the shores of the virgin continent to the west, whose colonization he fostered while he was Lord Chancellor under King James. Here he hoped to realize his Masonic ideal of a new civilization ruled by sages, which he envisioned in his *New Atlantis*.

Bacon was the first of the Utopians to resolve to create an ideal society as a living reality, rather than as a mere philosophical ideal. In America he wished to find a new social order in which all men will be free from the intrigues and corruption of English royalty and from domination by church and state, a democratic society of free men based on the principles of liberty, equality and fraternity, ruled not by monarchs and despots but by sages and philosophers.

To realize this grandiose scheme of creating a new civilization and a new system of government, different from what the world had ever seen, at the

beginning of the seventeenth century, Bacon organized a secret society of intellectuals called the society of Rosicrusse-Freemasons, which was a society dedicated to political reform concealed as a literary society for self-protection. It is acknowledged that he was the founder of Freemasonry, whose purpose it was to free mankind from bondage to the medieval political and religious institutions that formerly enslaved it--the monarchies of Europe, headed by the papacy.

It was a Herculean struggle against the greatest powers of the day, which only a hero could undertake. And against almost insuperable odds, this great humanitarian proved victorious--giving us today our heritage of political and religious freedom. Though his ideals of Liberty, Equality and Fraternity, which he first gave to the world in the Rosicrucian Manifestoes he wrote and issued under the name of Valentine Andreas were temporarily destroyed by the Reign of Terror and Napoleonic regime that followed the French Revolution which they precipitated, in America his Masonic societies were more successful in creating a new system of democratic government and a new society in which the ideal of human freedom and the rights of the common man was permanently established.

Bacon sent his son to Virginia as an early colonizer to help establish his father's Ideal Commonwealth in the New World. His name is known in the early history of our country.

The King James translation of the Bible and the Shakespeare Plays, the two greatest masterpieces of the English language, which did so much to make this language what it is, were both the creations of Francis Bacon; and while his editorship of the Bible, on request by James, of whom he was Lord Chancellor, is easier to understand, his authorship of the Shakespeare Plays is not generally admitted. Yet both literary productions reveal themselves by their unique superior excellence to have had a common author.

In 1609, the translators of the Bible from Latin into English handed their work over to King James; and in 1610, he returned it to them completed. As James was incapable of writing anything of literary value, who edited these translations while they were in his hands?

Smedley, in his *Mystery of Francis Bacon*, answers this question as follows: "James had an officer of State at that time of whom a contemporary biographer wrote that 'he had the contrivance of all King James' designs until the match with Spain (1617). It will eventually be proved that the whole scheme of the Authorized Version of the Bible was Francis Bacon's. He was an ardent student not only of the Bible, but of the early manuscripts. St. Augustine, St. Jerome and writers of theological works were studied by him with industry. He left his annotations in many copies of the Bible and in scores of theological works. The translation must have been a work in which he took the deepest interest, and which he would follow from stage to stage. When the last stage came, there was only one writer of the period who was capable of turning the phrases with the matchless style which is the great charm of the Shakespeare plays. Whoever the stylist was, it was to him that James handed over the manuscripts which he received from the translators."

CHAPTER EIGHT

FRANCIS BACON THE REAL SHAKESPEARE

We shall present evidence in this chapter to prove that the man who acted the Shakespeare plays was not the man who wrote them. To differentiate the true author of the Plays from the man who produced them, we shall spell the name of the latter *Shakspere*, as it appears on his will, and the true author of the Plays as *Shakespeare*, as it appears on the title-pages of the quartos and folios of the Plays. This difference in spelling has been disregarded by most Shakespearian students as an insignificant error, but in reality it has utmost significance, for it serves to differentiate between the actor of the Plays and their true author.

There is a yawning gap between the dramatic author of the Shakespeare plays and the actor from Stratford, a gap which no scholar has ever bridged. The author of the Plays and Sonnets passing under Shakespeare's name represented the sum of the learning of his time, a man well versed in matters of statesmanship, in court etiquette, in history, in law, in navigation, in philosophy, in foreign languages, in natural science, held revolutionary views in medicine, was keenly interested in morbid psychology and was a scholar of the Bible.

On the other hand, the actor, William Shakspere, was an untaught, ignorant, unlearned man, a drunkard and profligate. He was the child of an illiterate family. Neither his father nor mother knew how to read or write, and never did his children. His father, John Shakspere, a councilman of Stratford, had to sign official documents with a mark. His daughter Judith, at the age of 27, was still illiterate and could not sign her name except with a cross.

There are in existence but six known examples of handwriting. All are signatures and three of them in his will. In the opinion of those who have studied their scrawling, uncertain letters, they indicate that the writer was unfamiliar with the use of the pen, and that either he copied a signature prepared for him or his hand was guided while he wrote. This is reasonable to believe in view of the very scanty education he received and the absence of books in Stratford, where he spent his youth.

Shakspere's family was totally uneducated. He was the first of his family who could read or write. His father and mother, grandfathers and grandmothers, aunts and cousins - all signed their names with crosses.

William Shakspere was born in the little village of Stratford-on-Avon in 1564. Stratford has been called a "bookless neighborhood." His education, if he received any at all (which some writers doubt) was the most elementary and did not go beyond the three R's. However, according to Manly Hall, "literally and factually, it is exceedingly doubtful that any school existed in Stratford until after Shakspere's death, and...there is no proof of any kind that William Shakspere learned to read or write while in Stratford, or, for that matter, anywhere else."

It is generally admitted that Shakspere was a man without education and without learning. Pope speaks of him as "a man of no education." Voltaire called him "drunken savage." Ben Johnson said that he possessed "small Latin and less Greek," while Fuller said that "his learning was very little." Richard Grant White wrote that Shakspere was regarded, even down to the time of Pope, as a bewitching but untutored and half-savage child of nature." He was looked upon

as a rustic-bred bard who sang as the birds sing, a greater Burns.

Rev. John Ward, Vicar of Stratford, writing forty-seven years after Shakspere's death, and speaking of the traditions of his village, said, "I have heard that Mr. Shakespeare was a natural wit, without any art at all." Seventy odd years after Shakspere's passing, Bentham, in his "State of the English Schools and Churches" wrote: "William Shakespeare was born at Stratford in Warwickshire. His learning was very little, and therefore it is more a matter of wonder that he should be a very excellent poet."

Did William Shakspere possess such a vast amount of information as was necessary in order to write the plays attributed to his authorship? If so, how did he acquire it? There is nothing in his life to indicate that he was fitted or qualified to possess such education or knowledge. Only a miracle could explain the discrepancies between his life and his supposed works. We have mentioned that his family was uneducated and illiterate, that his father could not read or write, and that all members of his family signed their names with crosses, he being the only one able to sign his signature. The whole population of Stratford were densely ignorant; and, as Hiliwell-Phillips said, the village was "bookless." Their lives were coarse, barren and filthy. "It would indeed by a miracle," writes Donnelly, "if out of this vulgar, dirty, illiterate family came the greatest genius that has adorned the annals of the human race. It is possible. It is scarcely probable."

There was nothing in the life of the actor, Shakspere, pointing to outstanding mental qualities which distinguished him from his fellow citizens. He died in a drunken brawl. Not one of the many brilliant men of his age made mention of the fact that they knew him or were on friendly terms with him or that they honored him as a man of letters. No historian has explained how the Stratford actor, who early deserted his wife and family, talking but his Warwickshire dialect which was not understood in London, after coming there, could produce after a short residence in the capital, such finished and flawless literary masterpieces as the plays that go by his name.

Shakspere died in Stratford in 1616 without a single book in his possession, nor a manuscript he had written, nor original copies of plays he later perfected. Concerning his will, which mentioned the articles of clothing he left behind but not any books in his possession, Mark Twain comments: "It is eminently and conspicuously a businessman's will, not a poet's. It mentioned not a single book. Books were much more precious than swords and silver-gilt bowls and second-best beds in those days, and when a departing person owned one he gave it a high place in his will. The will mentioned not a play, not a poem, not an unfinished literary work, not a scrap of manuscript of any kind."

Many poets died poor, but this is the only one in history that died this poor; others all left literary remains behind, but this one did not.

The facts concerning Shakspere's life are very meager. The chief incidents known of his youth were his becoming a butcher's apprentice at a young age, his lying unconscious all night in the fields in a state of inebriation and his deer-stealing on the property of Sir Thomas Lucy, who had him whipped. In order to revenge himself, he composed the following rude and vulgar ballad about Sir Lucy, which only redoubled the prosecution against him, so much so that he was forced to leave his employment and family and shelter himself in London. Even though it is supposed to have been his first poetic attempt, how the writer of the following could be identified with the writer of the Shakespeare plays, is incredible:

"A parliament member, a justice of peace
At home a poor scare-crow, at London an ass,
If lowsie is Lucy, as some folks miscalle it,
Then Lucy is lowsie whatever befall it.

He thinks himself great
Yet an ass is his state;
We allow by his ears but with asses to mate;
If Lucy is lowsie as some folks miscalle it,
Sing lowsie Lucy whatever befall it.

Shakspere's youth was not spent in the atmosphere of libraries and books, but at drinking-bouts. After an affair with a young lady, Anne Hathaway, as the result of which she became pregnant, the two families got together and decided that in deference to public opinion, it would be appropriate for Willy and Anne to marry prior to the birth of the child. Shakspere unwillingly consented, but at the first opportunity left her and her child without support, and fled to London to join a band of vagabonds and adventurers who gathered around the play-houses. Here he eked out his existence by holding horses' heads outside the theater, in the company of ruffians, thieves, apprentices, pimps and prostitutes -- stormy, dirty, quarrelsome lot that gathered there. He organized a group of assistants who were afterwards known as "Shakspere's boys." Gradually he worked his way up to become a callboy, and later an actor.

After a number of years in London, Shakspere returned to Stratford with plenty of money, and bought one of the best houses in the town, becoming a practical businessman. Among his business activities was brewing (for which, on one occasion, he is known to have bought a considerable quantity of hops) which business he carried on in his residence at New Place. He was also a usurer; and there are records of the assumed author of *The Merchant of Venice* suing a local townsman for the loan of two shillings which he failed to return. In 1604, Shakspere sued Philip Rogers, according to court records, several bushels of malt sold him at various times. He also attempted to enter the gentry under false pretenses.

The closing years of his life were uneventful except for some participation in local politics. And as the first recorded fact in reference to the Stratford boy was a drunken bout in which he lost consciousness, and lay out in the fields all night, so the history of his life terminates in the same event, for he died in a barroom brawl.

When Shakspere died he left no books and no library. If he did there is not the slightest trace of it, for his will makes no mention of it. The man who wrote the Plays would have loved his library and would have remembered it to his last hours. He could not have forgotten his Plutarch, Ovid, and Homer to remember in his will his "second best bed with the furniture," his "brod silver and gilt bole," his "sword" and his "wearing apparel." The man of Stratford forgot his Homer and Plato, but his mind dwelt lovingly, at the edge of his grave, on his old breeches and second-hand bed clothes. However, according to some writers, this is not surprising, for, since he never owned a single book, he could not have left any. According to Donnelly, "There is no evidence that Shakspere possessed a single book."

The man who was supposed to have been the greatest literary genius in modern times passed on leaving no letters, no books and no library, making no mention of such in his will. Nor does there remain any evidence of the debris of his workshop, and no original copies of the Plays.

There can be little doubt that the man who wrote the Shakespeare plays in contradiction to the person just described, was the most eminent scholar of his day, well versed in the literature of classical and modern times. The plays indicate that their author read Greek and Latin authors in the original. The greater part of the story of *Timon of Athens* was taken from the untranslated Greek of Lucian, according to Holmes; while White claims that the Plays show forty per cent Romance or Latin words. Knight notes that the three Roman plays show a profound understanding of the whole range of Roman history. Moreover, the Plays show that their author was a classical scholar who had read Sophocles, Ovid, Horace, Virgil, Lucretius, Euripides, Aeschylus and other Greek and Latin writers. Some see evidence in the Plays that their author was a close student of Plato.

In addition to scholarly knowledge of classical literature, there is evidence that the writer of the Plays was well versed in the languages and literature of France, Italy and Spain. Another fact of interest is that evidences of scholarship mark the earliest as well as the latest works of the great poet. White says that the early plays show "a man fresh from academic studies." On this point, Donnelly, in his *The Great Cryptogram*, a voluminous work devoted to proving the Baconian authorship of the Plays, writes:

"The author of the Plays, whoever he may have been, was unquestionably a profound scholar and most laborious student. He had read in their own tongues all the great, and some of the obscure writers of antiquity; he was familiar with the languages of the principal nations of Europe; his mind had compassed all the learning of his time and of preceding ages; he had pored over the pages of French and Italian novelists; he had read the philosophical utterances of the great thinkers of Greece and Rome; and he had closely considered the narrations of the explorers who were just laying bare the secrets of new islands and continents. It has been justly said that the plays could not have been written without a library, and cannot, today be studied without one. To their proper elucidation, the learning of the whole world is necessary. Goethe says of the writer of the plays, 'He drew a sponge over the table of human knowledge.' Did William Shakspere possess such a vast mass of information?--could he have possessed it?"

The answer is clearly, "No." There is nothing in the life of William Shakspere known that indicates that he was fitted or qualified to possess such education or knowledge. Only a miracle could explain the discrepancies between his life and his supposed works.

The Plays indicate that their author had traveled widely and was familiar with the customs, social conditions, geography and politics of innumerable countries, but there is no record that Shakspere ever left England prior to writing the Plays.

The Plays could only have been written by a lawyer, or by one who had a legal training and profound knowledge of academic law, both theoretical and practical. There is nothing to indicate that Shakspere had such training. Francis Bacon was a lawyer.

The Plays were written by one who had intimate knowledge of the court of England, court usage and the psychology of aristocracy; but it is extremely unlikely that the Stratford boy had any such knowledge or intimate contact with a sphere so far from his own.

The author had an exceptional grasp of the great philosophies of the world, especially the Platonic and Aristotelian, and was himself a proficient interpreter of philosophical systems. There is no reason to believe that Shakspere

had such erudition.

The author of the Plays must have possessed a large library and had constant access to such reference material for his literary labors. But there is no proof that William Shakspere ever owned a single book.

The author of the Shakespearian plays had revolutionary political opinions and views of governmental reform. A humble actor or playwright could not be expected to have such views in those days.

It is clear that some unknown scholar whose learning was encyclopedic and whose station and personal tastes fitted him for such a work was the creator of the Plays. The only scholar of this type who lived in England at this time was Francis Bacon.

There is every reason to believe that the author of the Plays was a man of large learning; that he had read and studied Homer, Plato, Sophocles, Euripides, Horace, Virgil, Lucretius, Statius, Catullus, Seneca, Ovid, Plautus, Plutarch, Boccaccio and an innumerable number of French, Spanish and Danish writers; and since there were no public libraries in that day to which he could resort, he must have possessed a large library and have gathered around him a literary store commensurate with his own intellectual activity. Yet there is no evidence that Shakspere had such a library, for if he did, he would have surely mentioned it in his will.

Another unusual circumstance is the fact that the great literary genius should have permitted his daughter, Judith, to have grown up and reached the age of twenty-seven without knowing how to read or write. On this point, Donnelly, in his book, *The Great Cryptogram*, writes: "It is not surprising that William Shakspere, poacher, fugitive, vagabond, actor, manager, brewer, moneylender, land-grabber, should permit one of his two children to grow up in gross ignorance, but it is beyond the compass of the human mind to believe that the author of Hamlet and Lear could have done so."

Another matter difficult to understand is how the Stratford boy, coming from a backward town which had no libraries and where he had no access to books, and arriving in London, where he became a horse-holder, could have suddenly acquired the tremendous learning which the author of the Plays certainly possessed. There was nothing in his new London surroundings that even remotely resembled Greek, Latin, French, Italian, Spanish and Danish literature and studies, or medical, musical and philosophical researches. Neither did he come to London with such acquirements from his Stratford background, where his life was spent in a reckless, improvident, dissipated and degraded manner, in saloons rather than in libraries. From all available records, the young Shakspere is not represented as a studious youth who spent his boyhood in a garret, devouring the works of the classical authors, and dwelling in a world of thought and high aspirations, but his boyhood was spent as a butcher-boy, a deer-stealer and in the company of drunkards. There is not a single tradition to indicate any element of studiousness in the boy's character--a fact which is unusual in the biographies of geniuses, all of whom demonstrated their superior mental traits in their youth. Commenting on this fact, Donnelly writes:

"Only a miracle of studiousness could have acquired, in a few years, upon a basis of total ignorance and bad habits, the culture and refinement in the earliest plays; and but a few years elapsed between the time when he fled scorged from Stratford and the time when the plays began to appear, in his name, in London. But plays, now believed to have been written by the same hand that wrote the Shakespeare plays, were on the boards before he left Stratford. The twins,

Judith and Hamnet, were born in February, 1585, Shakspere being then not yet twenty-one years of age; and we will see hereafter that *Hamlet* appeared for the first time in 1585 or 1587. If he had shown anywhere in his career such a trait of immense industry and scholarly research, some tradition would have reached us concerning it. We have traditions that he was the father of another man's son (Sir William Davenant); and we are told of a licentious amour in which he outwitted Burbage; and we hear of wet-combats in a tavern; but not one word comes down to us of books, of study, of industry, or art."

The author of the Plays was a lawyer, a poet, a philosopher, a scientist, and a reformer; and Francis Bacon was a lawyer, a poet, a philosopher, a scientist and reformer. Bacon had "learning, industry, ambition for immortality, command of language in all its heights and depths; the power of compressing thought into condensed sentences; wit, fancy, imagination, feeling and the temperament of a genius."

It is an interesting fact that Stratford-on-Avon was never mentioned in the Plays, while St. Alban's, Bacon's home, is mentioned many times, indicating that the author had more intimate personal acquaintance with this region than with Stratford. The historical plays center around St. Alban's as the common center.

The Plays indicate that their author was an aristocrat who despised the class to which Shakspere belonged. He was also a philanthropist, which Shakspere was not. His writings indicated that he belonged to the Essex fraction, and disliked Coke, Cecil and Queen Elizabeth, as did Francis Bacon.

Bacon regarded the drama as a great potential instrument for good. He said, "Dramatic poetry is history made visible." He hoped through the drama to prepare the public mind for the advent of a new (democratic) era, which his secret Freemasonic societies were actively engaged in bringing into manifestation. Accordingly, Bacon took part in the preparation of many plays and masks for the entertainment of the court, some of which were acted by Shakspere's company of players. This he did while a young struggling lawyer when stricken with poverty, in order to earn some money. His foster-mother, Lady Bacon, disapproved of her son writing plays, which was looked down upon as something unworthy of his talents. This was one reason why he concealed this fact by writing under assumed names. But there was a much more important reason why he concealed this fact, namely his fear of persecution by Elizabeth for his indirect criticism of the English government which the historical Shakespeare plays veiled.

Bacon was opposed to royal despotism. He showed, as leader of the people in the House of Commons, that he was ready to use the power of Parliament to restrain the unlimited arrogance of the crown. He saw that one great obstacle to liberty was the popular idea of the divine right of kings. We can hardly believe today the full force of that sentiment as it then existed. Hence, in the Plays, he labors to reduce the king to the level of other men, or below them. He represented John as a cowardly knave, a truckler to a foreign power, a would-be murderer, and an altogether worthless creature. Richard II, he represented as little better--a frivolous, weak-witted, corrupt, sordid, dishonest fool. Surely this must have sounded strangely in the ears of a London audience of the sixteenth century, who had been taught to regard the king as anointed of Heaven and the actual vice regent of God on earth, whose very touch was capable of working miracles in the cure of disease. And the Play concludes with the murder of Richard.

Then came Henry IV, usurper and murderer, who confesses his own crookedness, and establishes a dynasty on the murder of Richard II. His son, Henry V, is the best of the lot--he is the hero-king, but even he rises out of a shameful

youth; he is the associate of the most degraded; the companion of profligate men and women, of highwaymen and pick-pockets. In his mouth the poet puts the declaration of the hollowness of royal pretenses.

In the Shakespearian play of Richard III, he depicted him as a horrible monster, a wild beast, a liar, perjurer, murderer, a remorseless, bloody, man-eating tiger of the jungles.

In Henry VIII, we have a king who divorced a sainted angel to marry a frivolous woman under the domination of the incitements of sensual passion.

In short, throughout the historical Shakespeare plays, Bacon tried to teach the common people that kings were nothing more than men, made from the same clay and ruled by the same passions, that heaven did not ordain them nor protect them; and that a king has no right to hold his throne any longer than he behaves himself. Was this not a revolutionary idea to put forth in that day? These Plays had the hidden purpose of educating the English people and preparing them for the day when Charles I was brought to trial and the scaffold. These "Histories of the English Kings" led to the Revolution and to constitutional government in place of monarchy and despotism and led to the birth of a new democratic age, which was ushered in by Bacon's Freemasonic Society. It is clear that the Plays were written by a humanitarian and political reformer and not simply by a poet.

It is interesting to note that the Shakespeare plays appeared when Bacon was "poor and working for bread"; and that after he obtained place and wealth, they ceased to be produced, although Shakspere still lived in Stratford and continued to be there for ten years more. One reason why Bacon kept his authorship of the Plays secret, besides the fact that his life would be in danger were their real seditious purpose discovered, was that he aspired to the position his foster-father, Nicholas Bacon, held as Lord Chancellor of the kingdom; and if he was known to have been the author of the Plays, this would have stood in the way of his political aspirations.

Another fact should be borne in mind. Francis Bacon was greedy for knowledge. He ranged the whole amphitheater of human learning. From Greece, from Rome, from Italy, from France, from Spain, from the early English writers, he gathered facts and thoughts. He had his *Promus*, his commonplace--book of notes. His writings team with quotations from the poets. And yet not once does he refer to William Shakspere or the Shakespeare writings! The man of Stratford acted in one of the Plays that go by his name, and on the same night, in the same place, is presented a "mask" written by Bacon. We thus have the two men under the same roof, at the same time, engaged in the same kind of work. Shakspere the actor and Bacon the mask-writer thus rubbed elbows; but neither seemed to know the other. Landor said: "Bacon little knew or suspected that there was then existing (the only one that ever did exist) his superior in intellectual knowledge"--that is, granted that Shakspere did write the plays that go by his name, which he did not!

Bacon wrote the plays when he was in dire financial circumstances as a poor lawyer. It was customary for impecunious lawyers in that age to earn money by writing for the stage. While quite young, Bacon assisted in getting up a play for his law school, at Gray's Inn, if he did not write the greater part of it. It was called "The Comedy of Errors," which then appeared at Gray's Inn for the first time, and was acted by Shakspere's company. Bacon and Shakspere then met each other, since they were both on the boards of Gray's Inn at the same time, once as writer of the play which the other directed.

After this meeting with Shakspere, Bacon decided to use him as a mask for other plays he wrote, which permitted him to freely express his revolutionary ideas without endangering his social and political aspirations by so doing; and at the same time it enabled him to keep out of poverty. Hence his cooperation with the actor Shakspere, in this manner, had everything in its favor.

That Shakspere could not have written the Shakespearian plays is indicated by the fact that the appearance of the Plays antedated his coming to London, which is believed to have occurred in 1587. Yet that high authority, Richard Simpson, in his "School of Shakespeare," showed that the Shakespeare plays started to appear in 1585! In other words, while Shakspere was still living in Stratford, in the year his twins were born, plays under the name of Shakespeare started appearing in London.

Are we to believe that in that "bookless neighborhood," the butcher's apprentice between his whippings, deer-stealing and beer-guzzling, was writing plays for the stage? That would be a miracle indeed. In 1587, the very year when he came to London and while he was probably holding horses at the front door of the theater; Shakespeare's play of Hamlet was being acted; and was believed by other playwrights to have been composed by some Lawyer. And not only did the plays attributed to Shakespeare first make their appearance while he was in Stratford, whipped and persecuted by Sir Thomas Lucy, and subsequently while he was a groom for the visitors at the playhouse, but at the same time, we are told, he not only supplied his own theater, but, with extraordinary fecundity, he furnished plays to every company of actors in London! Is it possible that while employed as a call-boy in one company, he furnished plays to other and rival companies? Would his profits not have lifted him above the necessity of acting as a groom or call-boy if he had done so? Is it not more probable that the "lawyer" mentioned above, as author of Hamlet, also supplied other theaters with his voluminous literary productions?

While some claim that Shakespeare was "prodigiously active prior to 1592" as does the distinguished scholar, Simpson, other commentators claim that he did not appear as an author until 1592! Either he was a menial when his plays were acted all over London, or he was not the author of them, appearing as they did before 1592!

Now, another dilemma confronts us--for not only is Shakspere supposed to have written plays acted on the London stage before he came to London, when he was whipped as a deer-stealer, but after he returned to Stratford, with ample leisure and the opportunity to make money by writing more plays, he never wrote a single one, but instead is known only to have engaged in such things as suing his neighbor for a few shillings for malt sold, while he, who, we are led to believe, was the most fecund of human intelligences, remained idly in his native village, writing nothing, doing nothing, vegetating for five to ten years among much-heaps and filthy ditches, until he died in a drunken brawl.

Could the author of Hamlet and King Lear--the profound, scholarly philosopher, be capable of such mental suicide, such a living death, during five or ten years, during which time he did not write a single play, not a letter, not a syllable, nothing but three ignorant-looking signatures to a will, when his hand seems to have been guided by his lawyer, since the testator, unaided, did not seem capable of writing his own name, and in which document he mentioned his bedclothes, but not a single book?

Another singular fact, from 1592 to 1598 eight editions of plays which now go by the name of Shakespeare were published, without his name or any other name on the title-page. *Romeo and Juliet*, *Richard II*, and *Richard III*, all printed

in 1597, were all without the name of Shakespeare or any one else on the title page. It was not until the publication of *Love's Labor Lost* in 1598 that we find his name set forth as having a connection with the play; and even then he does not claim to be the author of it. The title-page reads:

"As it was presented before her Highness this last Christmas. Newly corrected and augmented by W. Shakspere."

During the same year, the tragedy of *Richard II* is published, and the name of William Shakespeare appears as the author.

In his voluminous work, *The Great Cryptogram*, Ignatius Donnelly lists hundreds of identical expressions, identical metaphors, identical opinions, identical quotations, identical use of unusual words, identical studies, identical errors, identity of character, and identities of style between the author of Shakespeare's plays and Bacon's writings, covering almost 200 pages.

Donnelly says: "Bacon was ravaging all time and searching the face of the whole earth for gems of thought and expression, and here in these Plays was a veritable Golconda of jewels under his very nose, and he seems not to have known it."

Perhaps the greatest revelation of the Baconian authorship of the plays is the Northumberland House Manuscript. In 1867, there was discovered in the library of Northumberland House, in London, a remarkable manuscript, containing copies of several papers written by Francis Bacon. It was found in a box of old papers which had long remained undisturbed. There is a title-page, which embraces a table of contents of the volume, and this contains the names of writings unquestionably Bacon's, but also the names of plays which are supposed to have been written by Shakspere. But only part of the manuscript volume remains, and the portions lost embrace the following pieces ennumerated in the title-leaf:

Orations at Graie's Inns revells

Queen Mat

By Mr. Francis Bacon

Essaies by the same author

Richard the Second

Richard the Third

Asmund and Corneliea

Isle of Dogs

by Thomas Nash, inferior places.

Judge Holmes, in *The Author-ship of Shakespeare*, commenting on this says: "Among these scribblings, besides the name of Francis Bacon several times, the name of William Shakespeare is written eight or nine times over. "We may note that the name of William Shakespeare is spelled as in the published quartos and not as the man himself spelled it as Shakspere. While we find this name in Bacon's private papers, we find no mention of it in his published writings to indicate that he knew William Shakespeare ever existed."

It is clear that Francis Bacon possessed all the literary qualifications required to produce the dramatic works attributed to the actor, William Shakspere. Contrary to the popular opinion that Bacon was only a prose writer of philosophical works, it is a fact that he was a poet. Among the acknowledged writings of Bacon is a poetic paraphrase of some of the Psalms. He is also known to have been the author of a poem entitled *The World's a Bubble*. In a letter to a friend, Mr. Davis, he beseeches him "to be good to concealed Poets." In his Appendix to Stow's

Annals, Howes lists in order of prominence the poets that flourished in the time of Queen Elizabeth. He not only mentions Bacon's name on the list but gives it preference to that of William Shakespeare. By George Wither, Bacon was called the "mountain of the muses." There are some references to Bacon's poetic abilities; this is stated in *Manes Veruliamiani*, a collection of posthumous tributes to Bacon's memory.

Now it is curious that a man who was ranked as a poet above Shakespeare by a historian of the times should have left no important poetic works. The answer to this riddle becomes clear when we consider that while Bacon published anonymously or under a pseudonym. Significant is the phrase by Ben Jonson that faces the title page of the early *Shakespeare Folios*:

".....Reader Leoke
Not on his Picture, but his booke."

Writing on the relation between Bacon, the author, and William Shakspere, the actor, Manly Hall, in his book above referred to, writes: "Among the grist that came from Bacon's mill was a certain country bumpkin, one Willy Shakspere. This ambitious lad from the shires arrived in London penniless and unknown, but with an obliging temper. Such qualities suited Bacon's plans to a nicety. Here was a youth who longed for fame and lacked the qualities of greatness, a would-be actor whose opinion no one would take too seriously an obscure mouthpiece not worthy of being tried for treason even if guilty of something which resembled it. Always it has been the privilege of mountebanks to laugh at kings; but for courtiers, such hilarity is fatal.

"So Willy Shakspere emerged in print as William Shakespeare. He became the symbol of Pallas Athena, the goddess of wisdom who brandished her spear against the dark creatures of the world of ignorance and fear.

"It is quite improbable that Francis Bacon alone and unaided produced all the plays published under the name of William Shakespeare or later attributed to him. They were the product of Bacon's Parnassian empire, gathered, arranged, and vitalized by his personality, and each directly related to some problem of Bacon's complex mental nature. Many of the plays were drawn from older sources or compiled from fragments of contemporary dramas, but each was reclothed and repurposed, and each contained the secret story of Bacon's life and tragedy."

In 1902, there was published "A Judicial Summing Up" on the Shakespeare-Bacon Controversy by Lord Penzance, a judge of the High Court of London. He wrote as a judge, impartially summing up a case for the jury as to whether Shakespeare was the author of the plays published in the first folio in 1623. He says this is the first thing to be decided before going into the question whether Bacon was the author. He ends by quoting parallel passages from Bacon and the Shakespeare plays, which he says "is in my own opinion the most important matter bearing on the probability that these plays came in truth from the hand of Francis Bacon." This summing-up destroys any reasonable doubt that William Shakespeare wrote the plays.

Concerning the actor Shakspere, he says that "excluding five signatures of his, there is not a single scrap of his writing in existence." None of the plays were entered at the Stationers Hall, as required by law, in the name of William Shakespeare or by anyone in his behalf. As additional evidence that Shakespeare could not have written the plays, but rather that he was an ignorant man, is the fact that "there is no mention in Shakespeare's will of any manuscripts, print of any play, or of any books." Also the folio of 1623 appeared seven years after his death in 1616, without any authority from Shakespeare or

his executors or any of his family, which would indicate that perhaps the real author of the plays, who was interested in preserving them, was responsible for the appearance of the folio.

Also, Judge Penzance points out that the folio contained some twenty additional plays never before published, some of them never having been heard of before, which would indicate that the writer of both the known plays and these new ones must have been someone else than Shakespeare, who was then dead for some years. He adds, "It has been made plain and cannot be disputed that William Shakespeare was in truth, when he left home for London, an almost uneducated man. ..That these marvelous dramas should have been written by a man of deficient education is of course absolutely beyond the reach of possibility...In the year 1587 William Shakespeare fled from Stratford an ignorant youth, destitute of scholarly attainments, and by the year 1593 his name was attached to plays teeming with erudite learning...But the studies and labors of the man who wrote these plays does not stop here. He had made himself competent to read and appreciate the Italian and French languages, as well as Greek and Latin." To believe that the Stratford ignoramus who knew "little Latin and less Greek" could have written these intellectual masterpieces, says Judge Penzance, makes "a considerable demand on your credulity."

The judge goes on to say, "The writer of the Shakespeare plays had "a knowledge so perfect and intimate of English law that he was never incorrect and never at fault." This is in accordance with the fact that their author, Francis Bacon, was a lawyer. Lord Campbell, another English judge, in his "Shakespeare's Legal Acquirements," emphasizes the same point, saying that Shakespeare "uniformly lays down good law." But there is no evidence that the Stratford youth ever worked in a law office, and even the supporters of Shakespeare admit that the idea of his ever having been a law clerk has been "blown to pieces."

Lord Penzance, after an impartial and thorough investigation of the question whether Shakespeare or Bacon wrote the Shakespeare plays, disposes of the theory that the actor wrote them; and is convinced that Bacon did. His high position in the intellectual world and impartiality as a judge gives strong support to the Baconian theory.

G. White, in his *Life and Genius of Shakespeare*, after quoting a list of eminent Englishmen at the time he lived, says "there is no proof whatever that he was personally known to them or to any others of less note among the statesmen, scholars, soldiers and artists of his day." White includes Bacon. Ben Jonson also gives a list of prominent wits of his time, but omits Shakespeare, though including Bacon.

When Bacon died (or rather, underwent a feigned death prior to his departure for Germany, where he continued his work for humanity under the name of Valentine Andreas), the greatest scholars of the day united to acclaim him *the greatest poet that ever lived*. Did they say this because they knew he had written the Shakespeare plays? They must have known this, since, under the name of Francis Bacon, he wrote no poetry except for one or two translations. But Bacon himself never revealed the secret of his authorship of the Shakespeare plays except in the cipher story hidden in the plays themselves, just as he never admitted that he was a prince of the House of Tudor and heir to the English throne.

The above evidence should convince any unbiased reader that Francis Bacon was the true author of the Shakespeare plays; and that this is not a matter of mere belief, but is supposed by indisputable evidence, which we will now summarize:

1. Edwin Reed, the English scholar, has pointed out 885 parallelisms in the

Baconian works and the Shakespeare plays including identical expressions that only the same author could write.

2. Only five badly written signatures of Shakspere are extant. The details of his life before he left Stratford and after his retirement are unbelievably petty. There is not one sign of interest by him in the Plays. There is not one indication of love of literature or culture. It is extremely unlikely that this uneducated, unlearned actor, who knew "little Latin and less Greek," could have been the author of these literary masterpieces which a scholar characterized as "written in the most courtly, refined and classical English, replete with learning, full of evidence of wide reading, dealing with aristocratic life and manners, and instinct with poetry of the very highest order."

3. Shakespearian scholars admit that the plays show knowledge of Neo-Platonic philosophy, are full of Masonic symbols, knowledge of the ancient world, and an extraordinary vocabulary. Referring to the disparity between the known character of the uneducated Stratford actor and that required for authorship of the plays, William H. Furness, one of the greatest Shakespearian scholars that ever lived, said "I have never been able to bring his Life and his Plays within a planetary space of each other." The plays and sonnets, however, harmonize perfectly with the life, character, attainments and learning of Francis Bacon.

4. The ornament placed at the head of the Sonnets in the Quarto is also found in Francis Bacon's works, in the Shakespeare plays and in the King James version of the Bible. It is a specimen of Rosicrucian symbolism which at the same time reveals Bacon's true identity.

5. *De Augmentis*, published at Leyden in 1645, contains a frontispiece which is a pictorial allegory. Bacon is seated before a table pointing with the forefinger of one hand to an open book. The other hand restrains a figure clad in a skin that is struggling to reach a temple at the top of a nearby hill. Bacon is here represented as the author of two works--one open and acknowledged, the other enigmatical, dramatic and unacknowledged. The figure clad in the beast's skin struggling to reach the Temple of the Mysteries is the Muse of Tragedy.

6. The head-ornament of *The Tempest* in the Great Folio and that of the *ovum Organum* are the same, thus externally indicating the close connection between the two books: the one inaugurating the "Inventor of Things in Nature," and the other the "Inventory of Human Passions."

7. That ciphers were popular in Queen Elizabeth's day is well known. At least five of the ciphers that Bacon used have been deciphered. These ciphers are discovered profusely scattered through the plays, sonnets and ornaments, revealing his name and identity, also his position in the two brotherhoods of the Freemasons and Rosicrucians. In Ignatius Donnelly's *Great Cryptogram*, the secret story of Bacon's life is revealed, obtained from the cipher message hidden in the Shakespeare Folio, describing his authorship of the plays which he turned over to the actor Shakspere how Queen Elizabeth was shocked by the seditious nature of his *King Richard III* and, suspecting that this play was not written by its actor, ordered Shakspere to be arrested in order to learn from him, under torture, who was the real author of these seditious plays and to execute him for treason. Bacon found out about this and lost all hope, believing it meant his doom; and in desperation, he wished to commit suicide by taking rat poison. However, he saved himself by sending a messenger to Shakspere, telling him to immediately flee to Holland, which he did, and so the secret was kept. All this was deciphered by Donnelly from the hidden cipher message in the Shakespeare folio, whose code he learned.

8. Since the real purpose of the historical Shakespeare plays was to overthrow the English crown and replace monarchy by democracy by lowering popular respect for the divine rights of royalty, the danger of it becoming known that Bacon was the real author of the plays was so great that Bacon's concealment of his identity is readily understood. In 1530 Press Censorship was established and continued until 1594. If by chance anything to which her Majesty took exception happened to find its way into print, the unhappy printer, if he was not broken on the rack or his feet smashed into a bulk with boots, had his hands cut off and the stumps seared with a hot iron, according to Harold Bayley.

9. A most interesting piece of direct evidence of the Baconian authorship of the Shakespeare plays is the Shakespeare monument in Westminster Abby which had been erected by Pope. The statue is graced with the head of Francis Bacon, the stockings are engraved with the Tudor Roses and a Crown, the lace work on the ruffs of the sleeve is an exact repetition of the ruff worn by Queen Elizabeth. Between his feet are the Sonnet initials T. T. The fingers of the statue point to the Queen at the side. The place of honor in front is given to a beautiful youth--a crowned Prince--young Francis Bacon as in the Hilyard Miniature (found in Queen Elizabeth's prayer book). On the left side is the figure of the Queen's second son, the Earl of Essex, and the Queen's husband, the Earl of Leicester.

Commenting on this monument, Alfred Dodd, the greatest modern authority on the Shakespeare-Bacon controversy, said: "Think you that the Abbey authorities would have allowed all this apparently meaningless foolery if they had not known to whom the Shakespeare Monument was actually being erected--to Lord St. Alban, a Prince of the House of Tudor? Not likely...The High Dignitaries know the truth as a State Secret. And it is known today in the highest quarters."

Like the sword of Damocles, the dread secret of his royal birth hovered over Francis Bacon's head, for the moment it was revealed, and jealous aspirants for the Throne learned of it, his head would not rest on his shoulders any longer but at the foot of the chopping-block. Too great interests were involved and for this reason, he was forced to maintain strict secrecy, both as regards his authorship of the seditious historical Shakespeare plays (a true account of which is given in the Cipher Story in the plays) and his later political activities in Europe under the name of Count Saint-Germain.

CHAPTER EIGHT

THE CIPHER STORY IN THE SHAKESPEARE PLAYS Revealing Francis Bacon As Their True Author

Francis Bacon had no intention of being lost to the world beneath his own pseudonym, William Shakespeare. He was determined that future ages may discover the secret at a time when its revealment would not menace his personal safety as it would in his own day. So he had recourse to cryptograms, ciphers and acrostics, which were an important part of the statesmanship of his time and in which he was an expert. Each prince and petty noble had a private cipher to use in the administration of his political affairs. Bacon decided to put into the Shakespeare plays a cipher story telling their true origin--which would be forever hidden from the eyes of the profane but able to be read by those who had the intelligence to decipher it.

In his *Advancement of Learning*, Bacon not only acknowledged his interest in ciphers, but set forth one of the most complicated systems of ciphers ever devised, which he himself developed and perfected while still a youth of sixteen. So he decided to tell his secret story in cipher language and to include it in his plays which he turned over to the actor, Shakspeare.

In this way his great secret could be preserved from those unworthy to read it and be learned only by those with sufficient ingenuity to decode it. Thus he kept inviolate his momentous secret--that of his royal birth as the last of the Tudors--which hung over his head like the sword of Damocles, threatening his life and liberty from the day of his birth as the son of Queen Elizabeth to his subsequent departure for Tibet at the beginning of the nineteenth century, when he was known as Count Saint-Germain, where, he said, he could finally "rest," no longer haunted by the fear that his secret might become known, fall into the hands of jealous aspirants for the English throne and endanger his life.

For not only his own life, but that of his friends was involved in the preservation of this secret--especially since he was surrounded by spies and enemies, well aware that the prize of an empire was at stake, and willing to use any means necessary to forward their ambitions. The execution and death of Sir William Raleigh, who was hanged, drawn and quartered after an appropriate prologue of torture, foretold the fate that could any day befall Bacon himself were his secret made known, and warned him of the necessity to be as cautious as possible to guard his supreme secret at all costs and by all efforts, if his life was to be preserved and humanitarian dreams of a better world realized.

For Raleigh was not executed because of his depredations against the King of Spain, but because he was a member of Bacon's secret society, which played such an important role in the overthrow of monarchy and its replacement by a republican system of government, which Bacon hoped to realize across the Atlantic through the colonization of America in which Raleigh played such an important role. Every effort was made to torture Raleigh into naming his associates in his secret order, of which Bacon was the head, but he bravely died without speaking.

For, though he was Lord Chancellor of England, Bacon was then the leader of a Freemasonic secret society of intellectuals devoted to the replacement of the very monarchial government of which he was then the head, by a new political system of democracy, which was his original conception and whose ideals of Liberty, Equality and Fraternity he expressed first in the Rosicrucian Manifestoes, which

he issued through Valentine Andreas in Germany in 1615 and later in the Declaration of Independence, which Thomas Jefferson penned and whose signing he encouraged in 1776. Writing on Bacon's secret order and the necessity to preserve its safety by the use of ciphers, Manly Hall writes:

"Imagine the moral force of an invisible intangible organization which could not be discovered, but which constantly was active beneath the surface of what appeared to be a placid state of affairs. The ciphers appeared in numerous books by reputable and conservative writers. Nothing could be proved against any of them, but they came to be a mysterious band of avengers who knew they could not be tried for their knowledge without exposing too many persons to the throne."

Bacon, in his Essays, writing of "Of Simulation and Dissimulation," expressed very clearly what he later had to do in order to conceal the great secret of his royal birth while appearing in the courts of Europe under the name of Count Saint-Germain and other names:

"He that would be secret must be a dissembler in some degree. For men will so beset a man with questions and draw him on and pick it out of him that, without an absurd silence, he must show an inclination one way, or if he does not, they may gather as much by his silence as by his speech. No one can be secret except to give himself a little scope of dissimulation."

In his book *Shakespeare, Creator of Freemasonry*, Alfred Dodd claims that the man who wrote the Shakespeare plays was the founder of Freemasonry, which order he established in England in 1717 and wrote the ritual of the order. In a latter book, Dodd states that this man was Francis Bacon. Dodd writes: "Brother Vibert has stated that 'Our Legend says that Masonry came from France in St. Alban's time.' So it did. There was a medieval St. Alban of A.D. 303 and an Elizabethan St. Alban of 1560-1626. Both were MARTYRS." It is clear that the "Elizabethan St. Alban" was Sir Francis Bacon, Viscount of St. Albans.

In his book above referred to, Dodd writes that the great Shakespeare Folio of 1623 openly proclaimed for the first time in print, for all who were able to read and understand that "there lived a man who was a Freemason and who was the AUTHOR of the plays." Dodd says: "Students of the Elizabethan era are fully aware of the fact that some sort of mystery veils the life of William Shakespeare. The average man knows nothing of his personality...No one has yet suggested that a part at least of this 'mystery' was due to the fact that William Shakespeare was a Freemason, the center of a Ring of Rosicrosse-Masons, and that he purposely seems to have lived his life as though his motto was 'By the MIND alone shall I be seen.' And in the Sonnets he writes along the same vein when he says:

"Forget me - Let my name be buried where my body is,

And live no more to shame, nor me, nor you;

For I am shamed...You in me can nothing worthy prove."

(Sonnet LXXII - 149).

Alfred Dodd continues: "When Freemasonry emerged in 1717, the heads of the emergence who were the successors of the Elizabethan Rosicrosse and who had the secrets handed down to them were desperately anxious that the name of the Founder should not be associated with the genesis of the order, lest controversy arose on a personal issue and the emergence of the ethical cult was killed in the open thoroughfares of the world by bitter attacks on the personality of the Creator by self-constituted champions of morals, theology and state policies.

"The Founder's 'name' had been buried out of sight under a mass of extraneous speculations...Shakespeare was necessarily a CONCEALED MAN."

In a later book, Dodd admits that this "founder's name" was Francis Bacon. He writes: "Francis Bacon was the creator of modern Freemasonry, the Rituals of the Craft and Higher Degrees, and the Founder of the Fraternity as an organization. See *Shakespeare, Creator of Freemasonry* by the author."

Would Bacon, who loved the children of his brain, consent that the immortal honors which belonged to him be heaped upon an unworthy imposter, the ignorant actor, William Shakspere; and, since he was a master in the art of cipher writing, would he not embody in these immortal dramas that he wrote a hidden message in cipher form to tell posterity their real authorship?

This thought recurred frequently to Ignatius Donnelly, author of the voluminous work on the Baconian authorship of the Shakespeare plays, *The Great Cryptogram*. After he became convinced that Bacon, cipher expert, was the real author of the plays, he kept wondering whether their author had not embodied a concealed message in them, revealing his real identity.

One day he opened a book belonging to one of his children, called *Every Boy's Book*, in which he found a chapter devoted to "Cryptography" or cipher-writing. He chanced on the sentence, "The most famous and complex cipher perhaps ever written was by Lord Bacon. It was arranged in the following manner..."

Then the following ideas came through his mind: 1. Lord Bacon wrote the plays. 2. He loved them and could not desire to dissociate himself from them. 3. He knew their inestimable greatness. 4. Lord Bacon dealt in ciphers; he invented ciphers, and ciphers of exquisite subtlety and cunning. Then followed, like a flash, this thought: "Could Lord Bacon have put a cipher in the Plays?"

Basil Montagu in his *Life of Bacon* mentions that in his youth "he prepared a work upon ciphers, which he afterward published." Bacon wrote: "As for writing, it is to be performed either by a common alphabet (which is used by everybody) or by a secret and private one, agreed upon by the particular person, which they call cipher." This quotation appeared in Bacon's "De Augmentis," where he expounds his cipher system of conveying a hidden message within an explicit one. After reading these statements by Bacon and knowing he was a cipher expert, Donnelly concluded: "What would be more natural than that he, the cipher-maker, should not place in the Plays a cipher story, to be read when the tempest that was about to assail civilization had passed away--the Plays surviving, for they were, he tells us, to live when 'marble' and the gilded monuments of princess' had perished--even to the general judgment. If he was right; if the Plays were indeed as imperishable as the verses of Homer, they must necessarily be the subject of close study by generations of critics and commentators; and sooner or later some one would 'pierce the veil' and read the acromatic and enigmatical story enfolded in them. Then would he be justified to the world by that internal narrative, reflecting on kings, princes, prelates and peers, and not to be published in his own day; not to be uttered without serious penalties to his kinsfolk, his family, his very body in the grave. Then, when his corpse was dust, his blood extinct, or diluted to nothingness in the course of generations; then, when all vanities of rank and state and profession and family were obliterated; when his memory and name were as a sublimated spirit; then 'in the next ages,' 'when some time had been passed;' he would, through the cipher narrative, rise anew from the grave."

"So the life that died with shame
Would live in death with glorious fame."

(*Much Ado About Nothing*, ii, 3)

"That can not be called improbable what has happened. If I had not fallen upon the cipher, some one else would. It was a mere question of time, with all time in which to answer it."

Donnelly therefore read Shakespeare's plays over again with the view of finding a cipher in them. He searched in vain through ordinary editions of the Plays, but could find no cipher to make any sense. He then came to the conclusion that the common editions of the Plays may have been altered and corrected by commentators, and a change of word might throw out the whole count. He then decided to get a facsimile copy of the great Folio of 1523. Finally he obtained it. It was a stupendous work. He said: "It seems to me that the labors of Champollion de Jeaune and Thomas Young, in working out Egyptian hieroglyphics from the trilingual inscription on the Rosetta stone, were simple compared with the task I had undertaken." "Finally, after a laborious search, Donnelly found the cipher, revealing a hidden story which history dare not mention." "A cipher story," he says, "implies a secret story, and a secret story cannot be one already blazoned on the pages of history." He writes: "One can fancy Francis Bacon sitting at the play--in the background--with his hat over his eyes--watching Elizabeth and Cecil, seated, as was the custom, on the stage, enjoying and laughing over some comedy, little dreaming that the internal fabric of the play told, in immortal words, all the darkest passages of their own dark lives--embalmed in the midst of wit rollicking laughter, for the entertainment of all future ages."

Let us now consider the Cipher Narrative that Ignatius Donnelly discovered in the Shakespeare plays, not by any chance or imagination combination of words, but by a carefully planned out and executed cipher message embodied in the plays, which defies the laws of chance.

The cipher story tells us of a great court excitement over the so-called Shakespeare play of Richard II; of an attempt on the part of the Queen to find out who was the real author of the play, of her belief, impressed on her by the reasoning of Robert Cecil, Francis Bacon's cousin, that the purpose of the play was treasonable and that the unfortunate Richard was intended to incite to civil war and to lead to her own deposition and murder. The Cipher also tells us that she sent out posts to find and arrest Shakespeare, intending to put him to the torture--or "the question" as it was called in that day--and compel him to reveal the name of the man for whom, as Cecil alleged, he was but a mask; and it also tells how this result was avoided by getting Shakespeare out of the country and beyond the seas.

Now we note that this seditious play, which depicts the deposition and killing of a misgoverning king, had direct reference to Queen Elizabeth. It must be remembered, that no man would dare, in that age, or in any age under a monarchy, to openly advocate or justify the murder of kings; but the ignorant were taught, as Bacon said, more by their eyes than by their judgment; and what they saw in the play was a worthless king who had misgoverned his country deposed and slain. A mighty suggestive lesson, it might have been, to a large body of worthy people, who thought Elizabeth had also misgoverned her country, and had lived too long already, and who hoped great things for themselves from the coming in of James.

Now a certain Hayward had put forth, in a pamphlet, a prose history of the same deposition, which he dedicated to Essex, for which Elizabeth had him arrested and he was threatened with torture. If, then, she believed, as there is evidence that she did, that King Richard II was treasonable, that she was represented therein by the character of King Richard II, and that his fate might be her fate, if the conspirators triumphed, what was more natural than that she would try to have Shakespeare locked up and submitted to the same treatment as she contemplated

for Dr. Hayward? For certainly the offense of the scholar, who merely wrote a sober prose history of Richard's life for the perusal of scholars, was infinitely less than the crime of the man who had set forth, in gorgeous colors, upon a public stage, and had represented the deposition and killing of a king, night after night, before the very eyes of swarming and exulting thousands. And if, as we shall see, the Queen thought that Hayward was not the real author of his history, but merely a cover for someone else, why may she not have conceived the same idea about Shakspere and his play? Why was Shakspere not arrested? The cipher story tells the reason.

Now we may note that the second edition of *Richard II*, printed in 1598, with the scene of the deposing of King Richard left out, was the first one that bore the name of William Shakespeare on the title-page. Why should Shakespeare's name first appear, as the author of any one of the Plays, upon the title-leaf of a play which was the deposition scene left out, unless the writer of the play knew that it was seditious? And note that the play bears the name of "Shakespeare," not that of the man of Stratford who always signed his name as Shakspere. Was it not because of the treasonable nature of the play that the real author allowed Shakspere this hole to retreat into? Was it not that he might be able to say, "I never wrote the Plays; that is not my name. My name is *Shakspere*, not *Shake-speare*?" The Cipher narrative explains all this.

Now we may note that Essex was arrested for treason, and one of the charges against him was the fact that he hired actors to play King Richard II, and that Bacon was then assigned the very job of hiring the actors to enact the deposition and murder of King Richard II, as well as to prosecute Essex, his friend, for having had Shakespeare's play acted. As the Cipher story reveals, this was the work of Cecil, who knew that Bacon was the author of the play and that he shared in the conspiracy; and so gave him the choice of either taking this degrading work on his hands, of prosecuting his best friend for assisting in the production of the play he wrote, or of going to the scaffold with him. If such was the case, it was the climax of Cecil's revenge on the man who represented him on the stage as Richard III.

That sedition was in the air at that time, and that the theater was the main medium through which it was accomplished, is indicated by the fact that in 1597 an order was given by the Queen's Council to tear down and destroy all the theaters of London because one Nash, a play-writer, had in a play called *The Isle of Dogs* brought matters of state upon the stage; and Nash was thrown into prison. The period from 1597 to 1599, the very time when *King Richard II* appeared, was full of plots and conspiracies against the Queen and Cecil, and in favor of King James and Essex; and the play of *Richard II* was used as an instrumentality to play upon the minds of men and prepare them for revolution.

There is reason to believe that the Queen and court were aware of these facts and that the writer of *Richard II* should have been regarded in the same manner as Dr. Hayward, who was arrested. And if, as the Cipher story shows, the Queen ordered the arrest of Shakspere, who fled the country in time, why do we not have historical records of this fact? It must be remembered that in the eyes of his contemporaries, Shakspere was a very insignificant man whose whole life is veiled in the densest obscurity. There are no allusions to his coming and going; and hence we have his biographers arguing that he must have gone with his company to Scotland, and other places, while there is not the slightest evidence whether he did or did not. The only fact about him of which we are positive is the date of his death.

And if Shakspere and Francis Bacon and the play of *Richard II* were all

simply incidents in a furious contest between the Cecil faction and the Essex faction to rule England; if they were pawns on the checkerboard of court ambition, we can understand that at one time Essex' star may have been obscured and Cecil's in the ascendant, that Cecil may have filled the Queen with suspicions causing her to order the arrest of Shakespere, at about the same time that the Council issued the order to tear down all the play-houses in London; while at another time Essex, who was the Queen's favorite, as he was young and handsome, may have come back in her favor, and Shakespere could have returned from abroad, after the real author, Bacon, confessed that he had meant nothing by the play, which was historical. Now let us consider the Cipher story, which Donnelly discovered in the Plays, and which was not something he read into them, but which exist there for anyone to find if they follow the cipher code which he presents in his book.

THE CIPHER STORY IN THE SHAKESPEARE PLAYS

THE PURPOSE OF THE PLAY

But when poor King Richard fell a corpse at Pomfret, under uncounted blows, they made the most fearful noise; and again it broke forth; it seemed as if they would never stop. The play shows the victory of the rebels o'er the anointed tyrant; and by this pipe he has blown the flame of rebellion almost into open war. The well-known plays have even made the most holy matters of religion, which all good men hold in sincere respect, subjects for laughter; their aim being, it is supposed, to thus poison the mind of the still discordant, wavering multitude. They mean in this covert way to make a rising and flood this fair land with blood, so that not only their bodies, but their souls, might be damned.

THE QUEEN BEATS HAYWARD

The sullen old jade doth listen with the ugliest frown upon her hateful brows, too enraged to speak; but rising up and starting forward, took Hayward by his throat and choked him. He took to his heels and was running off in the greatest fright, but the old jade struck my poor young friend a fearful blow with the steeled end of the great crutch, and again and again. His limbs being now so weakened by imprisonment and grief, he is not able to stand the force of the blows the hinges of his joints gave way under him; and he fell bleeding on the stones. Cecil said to him, "Come speak out, why didst thou put the name of my lord the Earl upon the title-leaf off this volume?" On hearing the name of my noble Lord, her Grace was not able to restrain her passion any longer. "Thy hateful looks and the whiteness in thy cheek is apter than thy tongue to tell thy nature."

SHAKSPERE DID NOT WRITE THE PLAYS

Cecil said that Marlowe or Shakspere never writ a word of them. It is plain he is stuffing our ears with false reports, and lies this many a year. He is a poor, dull, ill-spirited, greedy creature and but a veil for some else, who had blown up the flame of rebellion almost to war against your Grace as a royal Tyrant. I have a suspicion that my kinsman's servant, Harry Percy (Francis Bacon's servant), was the man to whom he gave every night the half of what he took through the day at the gate. Many rumors are on the tongues of men that my cousin (Francis Bacon) has prepared not only the Contention between York and Lancaster and King John and this play, but other plays which are put forth at first under the name of Marlowe and now go abroad as prepared by Shakspere.

SHAKSPERE INCAPABLE OF WRITING THE PLAYS

He is the sone of a poor peasant who yet followed the trade of glove making in the hole where he was born and bred, one of the peasant towns of the west. And there are even rumors that both Will and his brother did themselves follow that trade for some time before they came here.

He goes one day with ten of his followers, did lift the water gate of the fish pond off the hinges and turns the water out from the pond, froze all the fish and girdles the orchard. They drew their weapons and fought a bloody fight for an hour, not stopping even to breathe. He left his poor young jade big with child...And while we were thus busily engaged, my Lord and some of his followers set upon us. Shakspere has killed many a deer. The body of the deer was indeed half eaten. He found it lying by the foot of a hill. We fought a hot and bloody fight. The pursuers followed him and took him prisoner. Percy and the rest of our men fled. My Lord struck his spur up to the rowell against the panting sides of his horse and ran him down.

My Lord was furious. He drew his pistol and shot him, and, as ill luck would have it, the ball hit him on the forehead, between the eyes. He fell upon the earth. They thought at first, from his bloody appearance and the whiteness of his cheek, that he was dead. The ball made the ugliest hole in his forehead I ever saw. He lies quite still. His wounds are stiff from the cold. He hath beaten one of the keepers o'er the head, sides and back, with the blunt edge of a stick, till it breaks; or he fell down to the earth under the heavy weight of his blows. Why, he is dead.

His Lordship then stopped his horse and said. He is in a faint. Bend down and put your ear against his heart, to see if he is yet living. He stooped down to listen and found that his heart still beat. He lay quite still for a good while. At last the ragged young wretch drew a low sigh and commenced gasping for breath. But it seemed his injuries were only flesh wounds. All our men as soon as they saw that he was taken prisoner or slaine, in the greatest fear of being apprehended, turned and fled away from the field, into the shadows, with speed swifter than the speed of arrows. Fear of being apprehended, my Lord who had, in the mean time, followed the others, came up. He tells them to make him a prisoner. After quenching the fire, the flames of which even yet burned, my Lord tells them to make a litter and lift the corpse up.

He scraped the blood away from his face. He remembered the rascally knave well; there was not a worse in the barony. The whorson knave was, at this time, about twenty; but his beard is not yet fledged; there is not yet a hair on his chin; it is smooth as my hand. He was almost naked; without shirts, cloak or stockings. He doth wear nothing but a cap; his shoes out at the heels, short slops, and a smock on his back, out at the elbow, and not overclean. The truth is, he lived, at this time, in great infamy.

I sent a short time since, your Majesty, for my Lord, Sir John, the noble and learned Bishop of Worcester, a good sincere and holy man; and had a talk with him; and I gave him the scroll. I ventured to tell him my suspicion that Master Shakspere is not himself capable enough and hath not knowledge enough to have writ the much admired plays that we all rate so high, and which are supposed to be his; and which ever since the death of Marlowe have been put forth in his name. And it is rumored that every one of them was prepared under his name by some gentleman. His Lordship advised that the best thing we could do is to make him a prisoner and, as soon as he is apprehended, bind him with iron, and bring him before the Council; and it is more than likely the knave would speak the truth and tell who writ it. But in the event that he lied about the matter, your

Grace should have his limbs put to the question and force him to confess the truth.

He is, I hear, at present very sick; he repents, in sack-cloth-and-ashes, the lechery of his young days. His purse is well lined from the gold he derives from the Plays. The Plays are much admired and draw great numbers and yield great abundance of fruit, in the forms of groats and pence. It is thought he will buy all the land appertinent to New Place. We know him a butcher's rude and vulgar apprentice, and it was in our opinions not likely that he writ them; he is neither witty nor learned enough. The subjects are far beyond his ability. It is even thought that your cousin of St. Albans writes them.

He cannot last long. His health is very poor; it was my presurmise that he is blasted with that dread disease, the most incurable malady. His looks prove it. One day I did chance to meet him and, although I am well acquainted with him, I would not have known him. The transformation was so great. He is not more than thirty three, yet he is, in his youth, written down old with the characters of age. His cheek is white, his voice hollow, his hand dry, his hair grey, and his step feeble; and his head wags as he walked. There is a beastly wound new-healed on the side of his neck, and a great wen of fall, something like the King's evil, which every day grows greater and his strength more feeble. He is flattering himself with the hope and expectation that he will get well. It is eating away his life, and he cannot escape the grave.

Although he is not yet thirty-three, his back is stooped and his hair and beard are turned white. And one would take him by his looks to be an old man. He had great bunches as big as my fist upon the sides of his throat and under his chin. I heard say he was very sick in the care of a physician. His health is very feeble and his step unfirm. He is troubled with several dangerous diseases; he is subject to the gout in his great toe; and I hear moreover he hath fallen into consumption.

And it is thought he must have that dreaded disease they call the French, which is one of the most incurable of all diseases; there is, in truth, no remedy for it. It seems to draw all the substance out of one and leaves only emptiness and weariness. It was, I heard say, brought hither in the reign of King Harry, the father of the present Queen, in fifteen hundred and fifteen. In the war against the French, our soldiers entered Holland and the Low Countries. They fortify the town of Gangate. Our forces take it after a hard fight. Our men become too familiar with the women of the place. And when the King and his forces marched back to England, they brought it along with them. It hath made sad destruction among the poor lewd people of this town.

SHAKESPERE THE ORIGINAL FALSTAFF

For I have some times seen him in his youth caper it about with a light heart, halloing and singing by the hour, and in the raggedest apparel, and almost naked. A bold, forward, and most vulgar boy. A gross fat untaught rogue, full of his own beastly desires. A glutton, rather over-greedy than choice. With his quick wit and his big belly, weighing two hundred pounds, a great glutton.

He is extraordinarily fond of the bottle. But I must confess there was some honor in the villain; he hath a quick wit, and a great belly; and indeed, I made use of him, with the assistance of my brother, as the original model from which we draw the characters of Sir John Falstaffe and Sir Tobe. To see him caper with his big round belly. It draws together to the playhouse yards, such great musters of people, far beyond my hopes and expectations, that they too in at least twenty thousand marks. It pleases her Majesty much more than anything else in

these Plays. It seemed to grow in regard every day. It supplies my present needs for some little time.

He is wise enough to save his goats and buy an estate of lordship. I heard that my Lord the German Minister says it was well worth coming all the long way to England to see his part of Sir John alone, in this play the Merry Wives of Windsor. He said: I tell thee, the man that could conceive such a part as this, and draw it so well, should be immortal... He fled to London to 'scape' from imprisonment. He lent money at a big rate upon a commodity of paper with security enough.

He had fallen into all sorts of evil courses with drinking wassail and gluttony. He kills many a deer, here and rabbit, hunting o' nights in vile, low, rascally company. Will and his brother are a pair of most pernicious villains.

BACON OVERWHELMED ON HEARING THAT CECIL SUSPECTS HIM OF WRITING THE PLAYS AND WILL HAVE SHAKSPERE ARRESTED AND QUESTIONED

On hearing this heavy news, I was o'erwhelmed with a flood of fears and shame. I saw plainly all the perils of my situation. I knew very well that if Shakspere was apprehended, he will be as clay, or rather tallow, in the hands of that crafty fox, my cousin Cecil. It was ten to one the whorson knave will tell in self-defense and for his own security that the play of Measure for Measure, that noble composition, the play of King Richard the Second, perceived much in these plays that satisfied me that his purpose is the destruction of the Christian religion (the Cipher is here incoherent) great and much admired plays work gentlemen pagan language most choice. No equal in England since the time of Gower. Enough brain power. King Richard the third. All my hopes of rising to high office in the Commonwealth were blasted. I am not an impudent man that will face out a disgrace with an imprudent cheek, sauciness and boldness would humble my father's proud and most honorable name in the dust and send his widow with a broken heart to the grave, to think that I should make a mock of the Christian religion. Hanged like a dog for the play of Richard the Second.

THE QUEEN'S ORDER TO FIND SHAKSPERE AND TORTURE HIM TO LEARN WHO WAS THE AUTHOR OF THE PLAYS

Her grace is furious and hath sent out several horsed, unarmed posts to find Shakspere under the lead of my Lord of Shrewsbury. Will divided his forces in three divisions. This thing must stop. Between you and your crafty old father, with your smooth tongues, you are stuffing my ears with continual lies and false reports in many a year. Royal rage. Commenced to rebuke him in language stern and fearful, which wound the ears of them who listen to it; for a worse tongue is not upon the earth. To ride with the speed of the wind through all the peasant-towns of the west. Make great offers to the man who brings them in, dead or alive. This woe-begone hateful, fat creature has been a mask known since a child. Strangest tale in the world; not to be believed. A lot of lies. Cecil your cousin, thy kinsman's, the old termagant plays. Terms of grace, pardon and reward and all of them if he will tell the name of the man who furnished him with this play and the rest of these plays. But if, on the contrary, he means to lie about it and play the fool, they will have to bear the sink upon their own heads. Fat fellow. Royal maiden is in a great rage. Swear should die a bloody death. Let him be imbowelled. Make a carbonado of him. Spared favors. Save our life fortune. No time to dally. Send out posts. Find Shakspere, Reward, offers, march.

The balance of the cipher cannot be given here, and is as follows. The crafty Cecil directed the officers that when they found Shakspere, they were to work upon him in every way possible--by appeals to his cupidity, his ambition, and his terror of being burned alive--to tell the real author of the Plays, and especially of that dangerous play which represented the deposition and murder of an unpopular King, and the execution of those councillors who stood to him in the same relation to which Cecil stood to the Queen.

Bacon, finding this out and to avoid shame to his dead foster-father and his living foster-mother, was contemplating taking his life by rat poison (ratsbane) and thus escape from shame and disgrace, and save his family's name from ignominy through his trial and execution as a traitor and infidel. As he convicted his own brother, Essex, by order of his mother, so now he would meet a similar fate. But he would rather end his life than let that happen. The cipher story then continues to relate the ensuing events.

It was a pitiful and terrible story, told with great detail. Bacon sacrificed himself, or intended to, to save his family and the good name of his legal ancestors from the disgrace of his trial and execution at Smithfield as a traitor to his Queen. He took ratsbane to end his life and prevent shame to the memory of his great father, Sir Nicholas, and the then living Lady Bacon, to whom he owed so much. The cipher story tells about his terrible sufferings that followed. After receiving the shocking news about Elizabeth's discovery that his play *Richard II* was seditious and her determination to find out its author by arresting Shakspere and putting him under torture, Bacon swallowed rat poison, lost consciousness for a time, and fell in the orchard and cut his head on a stone. He thought, in his dreadful mental excitement and agony, that the spirits of his dead ancestors appeared and urged him to die. Then came a young gentleman who was visiting the house at St. Albans, who went into the orchard and stumbled over Bacon's body. He thought at first it was a dead deer. And when he found it was a man, he drew his sword in great terror and asked who it was, and what he was doing there; and finally ran into the house and returned, followed by Harry Percy and the whole household, who came running.

Then we have Bacon resolved to keep quiet and counterfeit death, so as to allow the deadly drug, "which like a poisonous mineral doth gnaw the inwards" to do its work, rejoicing to think that in a little while he will be beyond the reach of Cecil's envy and the Queen's fury. Then we have the recognition by Percy that it is "our young master"; and the lifting up the body and carrying it into the house and to his room. Then follows the wiping of the blood from his face, the undressing of him, taking off "his satin cloak and silken slops" and sending for the doctor who was the village apothecary, who refused to come because Bacon owed him a bill.

Essex arrived to warn Bacon of his great danger; and observing that the doctor would not come, threatens to have his ears cut off. The doctor came and pronounced it a stroke of apoplexy. Meanwhile, Bacon who had taken a double dose of the poison, vomited it out, and his life is saved.

Percy is sent at once in disguise to Shakspere to get him to leave the country. He finds him in his bedroom with windows all shut, according to the medical treatment of that age, sweltering in a fur-trimmed cloak. He was greatly emaciated from the terrible disorder that afflicted him. Percy told him the news and urged him to fly. Shakspere refused. Percy saw that Shakspere intended to confess and deliver up his "Master Francis" to save himself. Percy was prepared for such a contingency and told him that the man who was the ostensible author would suffer death with the real author and asked him: Did you not share the profits; did you not strut about London and claim the play was yours, and did you

not instruct the actor who played Richard II to imitate the peculiarities of gesture and speech of the Queen, so as to point the moral of the play: that she was as deserving of desposition as Richard III? And do you think, said Percy, that the man who did all this can escape punishment?

When Shakspere saw, as he thought, that he could not save himself by betraying Bacon, he consented to fly. Then followed a stormy scene. Mrs. Shakspere hung upon her husband's neck and wept; his sister, Mrs. Hart, bawled; her children howled and the brother Gilbert, who was drunk, commenced an assault on Harry Percy and drew a rusty old sword on him. Harry picked up a bung-mallet and knocked him down, and threw him down stairs into a malt cellar. Then bedlam was let loose.

In the midst of the uproar entered Susannah, who at once quieted the tempest. He wonders "how so sweet a blossom could grow from so corrupt a root." When she heard Percy's story, she advised her father to fly. Mrs. Shakspere still insisted her husband was too sick to travel. Percy replied that a sea voyage would do him good: and they would go to Holland and then to France, and that "Master Francis" was acquainted with the family of Montaigne, and they could visit there; and meanwhile, Essex would, as soon as the Queen's rage subsided, intercede for him, and he could come back improved in health, to enjoy his wealth, while if he remained he would forfeit both life and fortune.

Percy said he had a boat ready, now unloading in London; and they could get them in time to sail. The night was stormy and dark, and there would be no one to notice their flight in disguise. Convinced of these arguments, Shakspere told his wife to get supper ready and to bring him an old suite of leather jenkins which he wore as a butcher's apprentice, and he proceeded to array himself in these.

Then follows an account of sick Shakspere's journey across the sea. While Cecil could not prove his case against Bacon without the presence of Shakspere, it became apparent to the Queen that the actor had received warning of the danger from someone in the court; and it might have been that facts enough came out to convince the Queen of Bacon's guilt; and from that time on, he could not rise to any office of trust during Elizabeth's reign.

CHAPTER NINE

OTHER MASKS OF FRANCIS BACON

Shakespeare was only one of the masks of the universal genius, Francis Bacon --prince of philosophers, prince of scientists, prince of the political reformers, prince of poets and Prince of England. He had many other masks under which he inaugurated the Elizabethan Renaissance of literature in England, putting forth his prodigious literary productions in rapid succession under various names.

Among these we find a host of plays, many of which were attributed to the pen of Shakespeare, whose authorship is unknown. Bacon chose the stage as the means of putting forth his message to humanity and to prepare the public mind for the democratic revolution which was his great aim and the goal of the secret societies for political reform (Freemasonry and Rosicrucianism) which he founded.

Among these other works whose authorship is under question are fifteen dramas, some not included among the Shakespeare Plays, yet which are attributed by commentators to the same hand as wrote the Plays. Many of these are included in more complete editions of Shakespeare's Plays. Of these, all except two were published in Shakspere's life-time, in nearly every instance with the name of William Shakespeare on the title-page. There is the play, *The Merry Devil of Edmonton*, announced as the joint work of Shakespeare and Rowley, and *The Two Noble Kinsmen*, written by Shakespeare and Fletcher.

In other words, the genius we call Shakespeare is found dissociated with the man Shakspere and writing a vast number of plays which the play-actor had nothing to do with. For instance, *Fair Elm*, which appeared in 1587, while Shakspere held horses at the door of the playhouse, as well as other plays which are now believed to be written by the Shakespeare pen, were never associated with Shakspere's name during his lifetime. This is compatible with the theory that a solar of vast intellectual productivity as Bacon flooded the stage of London with plays--to make money--for years before Shakspere left Stratford. It is utterly inconceivable how the man who left nothing behind him to show evidence of any mental productivity (except his alleged plays) and who dwelt during the last years of this life at Stratford in utter torpidity of mind, could have produced this array of unclaimed dramas.

Donnelly presents evidence that the plays of Christopher Marlowe were written by Francis Bacon, which is in accordance with the common belief that the plays of Marlowe and those of Shakespeare had a common authorship, including a group of plays which are claimed alternately for both Marlowe and Shakespeare. So similar are the style and productions of these two men that Donnelly remarks: "As if bountiful Nature, after waiting for five thousand years to produce a Shakespeare had been delivered of twins in that year of grace, 1564!" The twins were Shakespeare and Marlowe.

Like the actor Shakspere, Marlowe was a drunkard and died in his twenty-ninth year, as Shakspere did, drunken. He was a licentious, depraved creature who was about to be arrested for blasphemy, and escaped the gallows or the stake by being killed in a drunken brawl, "stabbed to death by a bawdy serving man rival of his in his lewd love." It is as inconceivable that such a type of person could have been a literary genius than the equally degenerate Shakspere; and it is more than probable that both were masks to conceal the true genius, Francis Bacon, who was the common author of writings that appeared under both their names.

In evidence of this theory is the curious fact that Shakespeare stepped upon the boards as a dramatic writer just at the time when Marlowe stepped off. Marlowe was slain in 1593 and the first appearance of a Shakespeare play was on March 3, 1592--that of *Henry VI*. But there are high authorities, as the *Encyclopedie Britannica*, who claim that *Henry VII* was written by Marlowe. Swinburne marveled at the capacity of Shakespeare to imitate the style of Marlowe as he did when he wrote *Henry VI*.

Donnelly also claims that Bacon was the author of Montaigne's *Essays*. His reason for sending this agnostic, anti-religious writing to his French friend, Montaigne, to be published in another country, in another language and under another name, was because it was impossible for him to express such irreligious thoughts in his own country, as this would be considered a blasphemy to his French friend, to be translated into French and published under his name, hoping that they would then come back to England and not arouse the same feelings they would have if it were known that an Englishman wrote them. Montaigne was a personal friend of Bacon and visited him in England. Bacon's brother, Anthony, visited Montaigne in France.

In evidence of the fact that Montaigne was not the author of the essays that were published under his name, which were sent him by Bacon, was the fact that he wrote nothing else of significance; for if he was really an author and thinker he would not have limited his literary productions to a single writing. Also it is improbable that Montaigne wrote the *Essays*, since he was a devout Catholic, while the *Essays* were the production of a skeptic, as Bacon was. As a matter of fact, they represented condensed utterances from his own essays, as well as from his *Advancement of Learning*, which he published later.

Bacon, writing on the Baconian authorship of Montaigne's *Essays* says: "The object as I take it, of his concealing the authorship of this remarkable book ("The Advancement of Learning") was that he might utter, under the mask of old age and of French license of speech, opinions which would have been condemned as utterly unbecoming for a younger man, an Englishman, and of Puritan family.."

Commenting on this subject, Donnelly remarks: "We are brought face to face with this dilemma: either Francis Bacon wrote the "Essays" of Montaigne, or Francis Bacon stole a great many of his noblest thoughts, and the whole scheme of his philosophy from Montaigne. But Bacon was a complete man; he expanded into a hundred fields of human labor. Montaigne did nothing of any consequence to the world but publish these essays; ergo, the great thoughts came not from Montaigne to Bacon, but from Bacon to Montaigne."

Donnelly further claims that Bacon wrote *The Anatomy of Melancholy* by Burton. Like Montaigne, Burton wrote nothing except this book, which appeared about 1600. It was written at the melancholy end of Bacon's life, so full of personal disappointments. In this book, we find a rough preliminary sketch of Bacon's later book, *The New Atlantis*. In *The Anatomy of Melancholy*, we find the following remarkable confession of its true author, Francis Bacon:

"I will, to satisfy and please myself, make a Utopia of mine own, a *New Atlantis*, a poetical commonwealth of mine own, in which I will freely domineer, build cities, make laws, statutes, as I live myself. Why may I not?"

Then through a dozen pages we find the expression of similar ideas as Bacon later worked out in his book *The New Atlantis*.

Some students of Bacon's unknown literary productions which appeared under the masks of other supposed authors claim that Spenser's *Faire Queen* and

Cervantes' *Don Quixote* were also his creations. In evidence of this is the fact that these two books, like Montaigne's *Essays* and Burton's *Anatomy of Melancholy* were the only literary productions of any value by their alleged authors. As Bacon sent the "Essays" to Montaigne for translation and publication in French, so it is possible that he sent "Don Quixote" to soldier-prisoner Cervates, who did not seem to be a man of high intelligence, for translation and publication in Spanish.

Among other works attributed to Bacon's authorship are *Comte de Gabalis*, about which we will speak below.

C H A P T E R . T E N

FEIGNED DEATH AND LATER REAPPEARANCES OF FRANCIS BACON

Much mystery surrounds the death of Bacon. Several contradictory stories are current. According to one account, he died from quinsy of the throat resulting from a curious and unbelievable accident--"His Lordship caught cold while plucking a frozen chicken!" (This is obviously a lie.) There are also contradictory stories as to where he died, and at least three locations are given. A monument to him stands in the Church at St. Albans, and this has been supposed to mark his tomb. It bears the epitaph which, when translated, reads, "Let compounds be dissolved." His secretary is buried at the base of the statue. It is believed that this was a feigned death, since a book bearing his picture as a living person was published in Germany about twenty years later. In his will, Bacon left his good name to "other nations and other times, and to his own nation after a certain time had passed."

There is evidence that Bacon never really died at the time he was supposed to, but instead passed through a feigned death--in fact the first in a series of feigned deaths, starting as Francis Bacon and ending as Count Saint-Germain. On this subject Manly Hall writes: "According to the various ciphers, Lord Bacon did not die at the time nor under the circumstances historically recorded. It is remarkable, to say the least, that the funeral of so great a man should have been marked by such complete obscurity. There is no record that his lordship lay in state, or that his remains were accorded any of the dignities which his position and honors deserved. The confused and contradictory accounts of his last illness and the uncertainty surrounding even the place of his death are significant.

"Feeling that his usefulness in England had ended and that his enemies ultimately must discover his secret and attempt to thwart his purposes, his lordship resolved to retire to the continent under the protection of a mock funeral. There is in the British Museum a small woodblock print of crude execution depicting Lord Bacon with his well-known beard, hat, and ruff, but otherwise arrayed in the costume of a fashionable court lady, stepping mincingly in high-heeled slippers from the map of England onto the map of Europe.

"Bacon's life after his mock funeral in 1626 is exceedingly difficult to reconstruct. He moved under a series of aliases that defy ready penetration. The consensus of research to date indicates that he lived for some twenty years working with his secret society as its hidden master."

There seems to be a conspiracy of silence about Bacon's burial place and much mystery surrounds it. His tomb is still unknown; and even if found, he is certainly not in it. The following personal friends report his death at their four different houses: Dr. Fuller, historian; Dr. Sprat, first president of the Royal Society; Dr. Allis, second president; and Dr. Rawley, Bacon's chaplain and amaneuensis. One says he died at the house of Lord Arundel at Highgate; another at his friend's, Dr. Parry in London; a third at his cousin's, Sir Julius Caesar at Muswell Hill and a fourth at the house of the physician Dr. Winterbourne. Nothing was recorded of a funeral; and there are doubts that it took place, which is strange, considering Bacon's universal fame, achievements and respect. Some speak of a mock-funeral followed by his departure for Germany.

The Dictionary of National Biography says that Francis Bacon was born at York House on January 21, 1561, as the son of Lord Keeper Bacon and his wife Ann.

He died at Lord Arundel's house on April 9, 1626 as the result of a chill or bronchitis, and was buried at St. Michael's Church, St. Albans. However, when his tomb was examined by his successor, the second Lord Verulam, it was found to be empty! Udny says he had a feigned death, the customary practice of philosophers in order to conceal their identity by disappearing from one part of the world and reappearing in another part under a new name and appearance. We shall see later that Bacon has two subsequent feigned deaths, as Prince Rakoczy and as Comte de St. Germain.

However, the conventional view concerning Bacon's death expressed by *The Dictionary of National Biography* is questioned by Burr in his *Light on Free-masonry, Lord Bacon Its Founder* who says: "Nothing is known of Lord Bacon's funeral or of his place of burial." Adding, "Evidence has been recently brought to light that Bacon's executors refused or delayed to act, and after 15 months, letters of administration were given to two of his creditors. His debts were 22,371 pounds and his assets 7000 pounds."

Burr quotes from a letter of Mrs. C. M. Pott to him in 1898, that she had been seen the late Earl of Verula in England who told her that all he knew about Bacon's burial was that he was not buried in the vaults under the Church of St. Michael's as he and others had made a thorough examination before the crypt was bricked up. One of the posthumous elegies written by Bacon in Germany in Latin, refers to his being 80 years of age at the time.

Mrs. Henry Pott, in *Francis Bacon and his Secret Society*, published in London in 1911, says about Bacon's mysterious death: "In 1626 he died to the world--retired, and by the help of many friends, under many names and disguises, passed to many places. As a recluse, he lived a life of study, revising a mass of works published under his pen names, enlarging and adding to their number. They form the standard literature of the 17th century. Collation of many works and many editions led and gradually forced the present writer into the belief that our Francis lived to a very great age; that he was certainly alive and working in 1640, and that evidence spoke in favor of his being still influencing his Society in 1662. Some years after these conclusions had been reached and communicated to some very learned German correspondents, one wrote recalling this correspondence, and making this clear and positive statement: 'Francis St. Alban, the 'Magus,' the 'Miracle Man,' died at the age of 106-7 in the year 1668.' A portrait was also sent representing him in Geneva with gown and shortened hair, as he appeared when he retired from the old age figures as the counterfeit presentation of the Rosicrucian Father, 'Johann Valentine Andreas,' at the beginning of a work passing under his pseudonym.

"We have, as yet, no reliable information as to the death of Francis St. Alban, or Father or Peter X. We have no record of any person who witnessed his death, or who attended the funeral. We are ignorant as to where he was buried."

Mrs. Pott does not give the name or address of her correspondent or where Bacon was buried or any evidence in 1668 any stronger than of his death in 1626. If Bacon really died in 1668, he could not have been Saint-Germain, who is said to have lived from 1710 to 1780 or 1785, but since Mrs. Pott admits there was no evidence of his death, there is every probability that after being last seen in Germany he traveled west as the mysterious "Polish Rider" who was the author of *Comte de Gabalis* and later appearing in Venice, in 1710, as Count Saint Germain. This remarkable adept evidently was a master of the art of rejuvenation and prolonging life.

E. Francis Udny, in his *Later Incarnations of Francis Bacon*, traces his history after he left England. The author was careful to use the word "incarna-

tions" not "reincarnations," which supports his statement about the habit of great adepts to appear to die in one part of the world only to reappear in other places under new names, in order to conceal their identity. Thus Bacon reappeared in Europe as Count Saint-Germain, his true name being kept an inviolable secret for reasons of personal security. When Cross examined his favorite subterfuge was to say that he was an heir of the royal house of Rakoczy in Transylvania, a prince denied his throne. This latter statement was correct, except that the throne he was denied did not exist in Hungary but in England.

For certain mysterious reasons, the later names assumed by Francis Bacon after his feigned death in England, when he reappeared on the Continent, have always been a closely guarded secret; and since he was an uncrowned king of England whose life might be imperilled were his true identity made known, we can understand the reasons for this secrecy, which he insisted that members of his secret orders strictly observe. And in order to safeguard the suspicion that Francis Bacon and Count Saint-Germain were the same individual at two different periods of his long life arose the theory that Saint-Germain was a *reincarnation* of Bacon, now held by the Rosicrucians in San Jose, California. This is obviously impossible, as the historical facts will reveal. It would have been possible if Bacon really died in England at the time he was supposed to have died, but not if he passed through a feigned death and reappeared in Europe under another name or rather many other names. Since when Count Saint-Germain came upon the European scene in 1710, he looked like a man who was 40 to 45 years of age, and since Bacon continued to live a long life after his mock funeral in England in 1624, the theory of reincarnation must be discounted.

Prince Udny, in his book referred to above, shows pictures of Bacon, Rakoczy and Count Saint-Germain, and claims that each was a different "incarnation" in a very ambiguous sense, for since Saint-Germain and Prince Rakoczy were contemporaries (Saint-Germain having been first seen in Venice in 1710, while Rakoczy, who was alive at this time, did not pass through his feigned death until 1735), certainly Saint-Germain could not have been a "reincarnation" of Rakoczy, any more than he could have been a reincarnation of Bacon, who left Germany in 1670 as the "Polish Rider" two years after his supposed death in 1668, and, after delivering the discourses of the Comte de Gabalis to Abbe Monfaucon de Villars, continued to live under the names of Rakoczy, Signor Gualdi, and Count Saint-Germain. And since when Countess de Gergy saw him in 1710, he looked 45 years of age, though he was probably much older, he could not have been able to reincarnate so rapidly from the body of Bacon as the Polish Rider into that of Count Saint-Germain, who claimed he was a member of the royal house of Rakoczy, who was educated by the Medicis.

Udny claims that the belief that Saint-Germain was the son of Prince Rakoczy of Transylvania is erroneous, because, due to his age, he could not have been other than the Prince himself, who was known to have been a profound philosopher. And since, as Udny claims, he passed through a "philosophical death" as Francis Bacon in 1626, as Francis Rakoczy in 1735 and as Count Saint-Germain in 1784, it is clear that the various "incarnations" but rather feigned deaths and reappearances under the new names in other countries, which is what "philosophical death" which he mentions in his *Comte de Gabalis* (referring to his departure from England after his supposed burial and reappearance in Germany, using the name of Valentine Andreas), implies. It is well known that many members of European secret societies had feigned deaths to conceal their identity, after reappearing in other parts of the world with a changed appearance and a new name. That was what Francis Bacon, Prince of England, did when he reappeared in the courts of Europe under the name of Count Saint-Germain.

Manly Hall, one of the greatest modern authorities on Saint-Germain, whose

identity with Francis Bacon he realizes but dares not openly declare, except in vague hints, as if it is some dread secret that it is forbidden to reveal, remarks that he "was so near a synonym for mystery that the enigma of his true identity was as insolvable to his contemporaries as it has been to later investigators." But, after reading this book, the writer hopes that this mystery will be solved in the reader's mind. Saint-Germain was not a "later incarnation of Francis Bacon" as claimed by Udny and Manly Hall (though in the same breath both admit the possibility of physical continuity of the same personality through a series of feigned deaths), but was the same man at two different stages of his unusually long life--unusual for the profane but not for the alchemical adept.

It is the writer's conviction that Francis Bacon never died, since his grave was found empty after his burial; and that therefore his later appearance as Saint-Germain was not a result of reincarnation but of altered name and appearance. Saint-Germain was none other than Bacon with his beard removed, who, as an uncrowned king of England, whose life would not be safe were this secret revealed, which would open him to attack by other aspirants for the throne, whose moral scruples were not higher than those of the characters he described when he wrote the historical Shakespeare plays, the reasons for secrecy and change of names was obvious, for it gave him a degree of freedom of action he otherwise would not have. How long would his life be safe were it known who he really was? Like the sword of Damocles, this dread secret hovered over him throughout his life down through the centuries and explains the mysteriousness that surrounds him and why, in spite of the general belief in his royal birth and his own occasional allusions to it, he consistently refused to reveal his true origin and identity, which his natural bearing and manner of dealing with the crowned heads of Europe unmistakably reveals to the careful observer.

Another of Bacon's masks was that of Prince Francis Rakoczy of Transylvania, which was his favorite subterfuge as Count Saint-Germain when questioned about his true name and origin. This name he assumed after that of Comte de Gabalis and both before and after he used the name of Count Saint-Germain. Regarding the claim that Bacon assumed the name of Prince Rakoczy prior to his appearance as Count Saint-Germain, the following members of the Rakoczy line in Transylvania are recorded in the *Encyclopedia Britannica*:

George I (1591-1648)
George II (1621-1660)
Francis I (1645-1676)
Francis II (1676-1735)

Since Mrs. Pott believes that he "died" in 1668, it was probably at this time that he lost his prior identity as Bacon and Andreas and went to southeastern Europe where he used the name of Francis II, Prince of Transylvania, interchangably with that of Signor Gualdi and Count Saint-Germain, finally using chiefly the latter and resorting to the Rakoczy name only when cross-examined as to his origin and real name.

To claim that he was a last surviving member of an extinct small royal house in Hungary was a very convenient manner of putting questioners off the track, in view of the fact that he evidently was of royal breeding by his appearance and mannerism which would require some kind of explanation. So, just as he previously used the name of Valentine Andreas, a living German theologian--and probably with his consent and cooperation--so he later used the name of Francis II, Prince of Transylvania, who was also living until 1735, when he underwent a feigned death, after which it was much easier for Saint-Germain to claim he was a Rakoczy.

It is probable that just as Saint-Germain secured the consent of Valentine Andreas to use his name, so he obtained from the retired Prince Rakoczy before his feigned death, in 1735, though detection of an imposter using his name would be very embarrassing for the Prince. Theosophists still call Saint-Germain "Master R," or Rakoczy, unaware of the fact that both Saint-Germain and Prince Rakoczy were contemporaries and probably friends.

In 1615, while residing in England, Bacon sent to Valentine Andreas his Rosicrucian disciple in Germany, the "Confessio" and "Fama Fraternitatis," otherwise known as the Rosicrucian Manifestoes, which he issued under his name and which had a powerful influence on European thought since they first propagated the ideals of the French and American Révolutions: Liberty, Equality and Fraternity. *The Alchemical Marriage*, another Rosicrucian work that Bacon similarly published and spread through Valentine Andreas at about the same time as the Rosicrucian Manifestoes. Later, when he came to Germany, he continued to issue his writings while using Andreas as his mask.

At about 1670, Bacon decided to travel westward; and appeared as the famous Polish Rider who delivered a series of discourses to Abbe Monfaucon de Villars; that the Abbe later published as a mysterious book, *Comte de Gabalis*, which first appeared anonymously and which was subsequently reprinted in 1715, 1742 and later in 1910, which edition had a picture of the Polish Rider on the frontispiece, represented as being the unknown author who came from the direction of Germany.

The 1742 edition contained the name of Abbe Monfaucon de Villars as the author. In the 1910 edition, there appeared an account of the life of the Abbe, who is supposed to have been assassinated in 1673, three years after the book first appeared. Like many of his craft, however, the true place of his burial is unknown. Perhaps he only "pretended to die, as is the way of Philosophers, who feign death in one place only to transplant themselves to another," as the book says.

Concerning the enigmatical passing of Francis Bacon, Rawley in his *Resuscitatio*, published in 1670, two years after his second feigned death and the year when he left Germany and appeared in western Europe as the Polish Rider, just Francis Bacon "made a holy and humble retreat to the cool shades of rest, where he remained triumphant over fare and fortune, till heaven was pleased to summon him to a more glorious and triumphant rest," which means that after he left England he made his retreat in Germany, to commence anew, under the name of Valentine Andreas, the work he commenced in England under the equally fictitious name of Francis Bacon, since his true name was Francis Tudor, Prince of England.

Since Bacon appeared in Western Europe to Abbe Monfaucon de Villars in 1670 as the mysterious Polish Rider, we can well understand the origin of the belief that in 1668, two years before, he died in Germany, since he probably left and disappeared at this time, just as 44 years previously, in 1624, he disappeared from England, when he was supposed to have died. As the Polish Rider, he traveled westward from Germany, which he left in 1668; and two years later, in 1670, he visited the Abbe Monfaucon de Villars and delivered the discourses of the *Comte de Gabalis*. He appeared to be about 40 years of age, though he really was much more. This means that his "death" in 1668, referred to by Mrs. Pott, was as feigned as his death in 1624 in England, for if he died in 1668, he could not have delivered the discourses of the *Comte de Gabalis* to Abbe Monfaucon de Villars in 1670.

The Polish Rider then went southeast and probably came to Hungary to visit Francois Rakoczi II, member of the royal house of Transylvania, who was crowned

by that title by his barons, though he never actually reigned. He probably revealed to him his great secret, namely that of his royal birth in England, and begged him to permit him to use him as a mask, as he formerly used the actor Shakspere and the German theological, Valentine Andreas, to which Rakoczi, who was a devout man, an idealist and philosopher, consented, giving him the right to use his name as the occasion demanded.

From that time onward, we find Bacon, now known in Italy, where he was known as Signor Gualdi and later as Count Saint-Germain, using the name of Prince Rakoczi from time to time, as he did in Leipzig in 1777, according to George Hezekiel, and at times changing it to Graf Tzarogy, which was an anagram for Ragotsy (Rakoczy).

Thus there were two Prince Rakoczys living simultaneously, who spent much of his time in a monastery near Paris, hidden from the world, and the other his counterfeit, Bacon or Saint-Germain, which may have been an embarrassing situation for both when this fact was discovered, which was relieved by the feigned death of Rakoczy in 1735, concerning which we quote from the book, *Francois Rakoczi II, Prince of Transylvania*, which gives details of the events preceding the Prince's death, with extracts from letters of a certain Clement Mike, who was evidently devoted to him and was with him to the end. Mike's account is as follows: "God made us orphans at three o'clock in the morning" (Good Friday, the 8th of April, 1735) "by taking from us our dear Master and Father. The body was all ready to lie in state in a palace where for three days a religious service was held. All could see the body; at one time there were thirty Turks present; but, in spite of that, people do not believe that the Prince is dead. They say that someone else was dressed up on his clothes and that he himself is gone away. How I wish it were true!"

In this 1742 edition of the book which bore the name of *Comte de Gabalis*, appeared a commentary which opened with the following explanation of the origin of the book: "Paracelsus says of the practice of Philosophy: 'This Art is taught by Gabalis (the spiritual perception of man).' These words inspired the title of the *Comte de Gabalis*, which veiled the identity of the great teacher from whom the instructions contained in these discourses was received. The Comte's true name will be widely recognized." His true name at this time was Francis Bacon, a secret which could not be revealed.

Commenting on the above introductory statement in the *Comte de Gabalis*, E. F. Udry, in his *Later Incarnations of Francis Bacon*, remarks: "It will indeed. Who else can he be than Francis Bacon, Vicount St. Alban, who did not really die till 1668, two years before the Discourses were first printed?" But Manly Hall, writing on "The Man Who Does Not Die," in an introduction to his *The Most Holy Trinosophia*, by Count Saint-Germain, says: "There is a tendency among mystical writers to connect him with the mysterious Comte de Gabalis who appeared to Abbe Villars and delivered several discourses. Now if the author of the *Comte de Gabalis* was Francis Bacon, according to Manly Hall, if both are true, the conclusion is obvious that both Bacon and Saint-Germain were one and the same person.

The author of the *Comte de Gabalis*, hinting at what he dared not express, mentions a feigned death, of a man changing his name, and to a certain extent his personal appearance, and reappearing in some other part of the world as a different character; and of whom could he be speaking other than himself? In this book we read:

"In the higher degrees of the Order, a Philosopher has power to abandon one physical body no longer suited for his purpose; and to occupy another previously prepared for his use. This transition is called an Avesa, and accounts for the

fact that many Masters known to history seemingly never die. The Comte de Gabalis is himself a noteworthy example of this temporal immortality." To everything there is a season, and a time for every purpose under the heaven; a time to be born and a time to die; a time to plant and a time to pluck up that which is planted" (Ecclesiastes III, 1 and 2).

Udny comments on this: "None is better qualified to speak on this subject than the anonymous author of the above passage who was himself the Comte de Gabalis, giver of the instructions contained in the Discourses on which he is commenting. He is also an exalted Brother of the "Order of Philosophers" and has in his own person carried out three mysterious deaths--as Bacon in 1626, as Rakoczy in 1735, and as Saint-Germain in 1784. In all three cases, he was careful to leave behind no actual proof that he was still living in the world."

The writer does not agree with Udny in claiming that he passed through a feigned death in 1735 as Prince Rakoczy. It was Rakoczy himself, a distinct individual, who did so. The only feigned deaths that Bacon had was his "death" in England in 1624, perhaps his "death" in Europe in 1668, and his later feigned death as Saint-Germain in 1784, 160 years later. His calling himself Rakoczy has nothing to do with the death of the real Rakoczy, feigned or otherwise, in 1735, at which time Saint-Germain was active in European affairs under the latter name, using the name Rakoczy only occasionally to conceal his origin as son of Queen Elizabeth and heir to the English throne.

Again in 1784 we find another feigned death of a mysterious individual who went by the name of Count Saint-Germain, concerning him Gustav Bord said, "He misled people by silence up to his last hour, and his devoted followers allow him to do so still, as it were from the tomb making him arise from it and to live again, and to go about even in our own day."

Udny writes that between 1713 and 1717 we find Rakoczy living near Paris; and he identifies him with Count Saint-Germain and Francis Bacon. But this can not be, because in 1710 he was seen in Venice and used the name of Count Saint-Germain. It must, therefore, have been the real Prince Rakoczy who lived near Paris at this time. The following is quoted from a letter by the Duchess of Orleans, written at this time, quoted in *Francois Rakoczy, Prince de Transylvania*: "The Prince Rakoczy is living about five or six leagues from Paris in a house of monks, who are called Camaldules and whose rule of life is almost as strict as that of Chartreux. He lives with them as though he were one of them, takes part in their prayers and vigils, and fasts frequently." The Duchess describes him as follows: "He (Rakoczy) is a splendid man and intellectual. He has read much and has knowledge on all subjects." It is probable that Saint-Germain knew Rakoczy, since their manner of living were not far apart; and that Rakoczy, who lived in retirement, permitted him to use his name." Also, to prevent difficulties arising from Saint-Germain induced him to undergo a feigned death in 1735. Of course these are only the writer's conjectures, for which he cannot offer any definite proof.

It is, however, true that Saint-Germain openly appeared in Leipzig in 1717 as Prince Rakoczy and was also known as Graf Tzarogy, a Russian general which name was merely an anagram for Ragotzy (Racoczy).

In addition to his claiming that he was really a prince of the line of Rakoczy, in order to conceal his true origin, was the parallel legend he fostered that he was raised by the Medicis. His admirer, Prince Charles of Hesse, evidently believed both of these pretenses of his, as indicated by his statement:

"This House (Medici), as is well known, was in possession of the highest

knowledge from them; but he claimed to have learned that of Nature by his own application and researches. He thoroughly understood herbs and plants and had invented the medicines of which he constantly made use, which prolonged his life and health. I still have all his recipes, but the physicians ran riot against his science after his death. There was a physician, Losseau, who had been an apothecary, and to whom I gave 1200 francs a year to work at the medicines which Count Saint-Germain taught him, among others chiefly his tea, which the rich bought and the poor received gratis."

Caesar Cantu, librarian of the great library of Milan, in his historical work, *Illustrati Italianiani*, wrote: "The Marquis of San Germano appears to have been the son of Prince Rakoczy of Transylvania; he was also much in Italy; much is recounted of his travels in Italy and Spain; he was greatly protected by the last Grand Duke of Tuscany, who had educated him." It was also said that he was educated at the University of Siena. Mme. de Genlis, in her memoirs, mentions having heard of him in Siena during a visit she paid to the town. It was claimed that he was a protege of the last Medici. However, it is probable that this claim, like the one that he was a Rakoczy, was false and was a subterfuge of his to conceal his true origin and identity.

From the above evidence, it is clear that Francis Bacon, author of the Shakespeare plays, did not die at the time when he was supposed to have in 1626. Feigned death was a common practice among a group of philosophers of a certain order to which he belonged and of which he was the leader. The burial place of Francis Bacon has never been divulged, since it was unknown; and it was unknown because it did not exist. While he was supposed to have died in 1626 at the age of 65, it is significant that a rare print made in Germany by Valentine Andreas, who was author of certain Rosicrucian tracts of profound influence in their time, appeared to be a portrait of Lord Bacon at the age of 80, fifteen years after his feigned death in England at the age of 65. He had now grown a long beard. The picture depicts a helmet, four crosses and the St. Andrew's cross, and the arms of St. Alban's town. These symbolized the fact that Bacon was residing in Germany, directing the work of the political and philosophical fraternity which he originated in England during the previous century and which was known as the society of Rosicrusse-Freemasons.

We may divide Bacon's long life into the following chronological periods:

- 1561: His birth as Francis Tudor, son of Queen Elizabeth.
- 1561-1624: His life as Francis Bacon in England.
- 1624-1670: His residence in Germany after his feigned death and departure from England in 1624, during which he issued his writings under the name of Valentine Andreas.
- 1670: His departure from Germany as the Polish Rider and appearance in western and southern Europe.
- 1687: His appearance in Venice as Signor Gualdi.
- 1710: His reappearance in Venice as Count Saint-Germain.
- 1710-1784: His labors in Europe as Count Saint-Germain, devoted chiefly to political activity, terminating in his feigned death in 1784.
- 1822: When he was last seen in Europe, prior to his departure for Tibet and 85 years' residence in the Far East.

- 1925: His reappearance in the West when seen at a Masonic convention in France in this year.
- 1933: His sending a letter to the head of a Co-Masonic Society in San Jose, Costa Rica.
- 1960: Probably still living.

CHAPTER ELEVEN

THE MYSTERIOUS ROSICRUCIAN WHO WAS THE FATHER OF THE AMERICAN REPUBLIC

Throughout his life, Francis Bacon's fondest hope was the creation of a Utopia across the Atlantic, the realization of his "New Atlantis" in the form of a society of free men, governed by sages and scientists, in which his Freemasonic and Rosicrucian principles would govern the social, political and economic life of the new nation. It was for this reason why, as Lord Chancellor, he took such an active interest in the colonization of America, and why he sent his son to Virginia as one of the early colonists. For it was in America, through the pen of Thomas Paine and the writings of Thomas Jefferson, as well as through the revolutionary activities of his many Rosicrucian-Freemasonic followers, most prominent among whom were George Washington and Benjamin Franklin, that he hoped to create a new nation dedicated to his political philosophy.

In his *Secret Destiny of America*, Manly Hall, Bacon's most understanding modern scholar, refers to the appearance in America, prior to the signing of the Declaration of Independence in 1776, of a mysterious Rosicrucian philosopher, a strict vegetarian who ate only foods that grew above the ground, who was a friend and teacher of Franklin and Washington and who seemed to have played an important role in the founding of the new republic. Why most historians failed to mention him is a puzzle, for that he existed is a certainty.

He was known as the "Professor." Together with Franklin and Washington, he was a member of the committee selected by the Continental Congress in 1775 to create a design for the American Flag. The design he made was accepted by the committee and given to Betsy Ross to execute into the first model.

A year later, on July 4, 1776, this mysterious stranger, whose name nobody knew, suddenly appeared in Independence Hall and delivered a stirring address to the fearful men there gathered, who were wondering whether they should risk their lives as traitors by affixing their names to the memorable document which Thomas Jefferson wrote and of whose ideals Francis Bacon, founder of Freemasonry and Rosicrucianism, was the true originator.

The flag unfurled at Cambridge, Mass. in 1775, which the Professor designed, symbolized the union of the colonies; it was called the Grand Union Flag, and its design was as follows: In the blue field of the upperleft-hand corner was the white diagonal cross of St. Andrews. Imposed on this was the Red Cross, which was given the name of St. George. The thirteen stripes, seven of red and six of white, alternating in the flag, represented the thirteen colonies.

The flag was used for some time, but owing to its similarity with the British flag, which supposedly symbolized the unity of England and Scotland, considerable controversy arose over it. In order to overcome this objection, in 1776 it was decided to design another flag which would follow the spirit of the original design; and the inverted triangle over the upright triangle, generally known as the St. Andrew's Cross, a Masonic symbol of Kabbalistic origin and denoting that the originator of the flag was a Freemason and Rosicrucian, was preserved by using a six-pointed star, placed in irregular fashion on a blue background in the form of a new constellation.

When General Johnson and Doctor Franklin visited Mrs. Elizabeth Ross, otherwise known as Betsy Ross, to get her cooperation in making the flag, the five-

pointed star appealed to her as being more beautiful than the six-pointed star of the Professor's original design which the committee accepted. Hence, out of deference to her sense of beauty, the five-pointed stars were used instead, and thirteen of them were placed in a circle on a blue field with the standard seven red and six white stripes completing the flag.

This sample flag was made just before the Declaration of Independence, although the resolution endorsing it was not passed by the Continental Congress until July 14, 1777.

A second time did this mysterious stranger, the "Professor," whose name and origin was unknown, pay a vital role in American history. This time it was at the signing of the Declaration of Independence. It was on June 7, 1776, that Richard Henry Lee, a delegate from Virginia, offered in Congress the first resolution declaring that the United Colonies were, and of right ought to be, free and independent states. Soon after Mr. Lee introduced his resolution, he was taken sick and returned to his home in Virginia, whereupon on June 11th, 1776, Thomas Jefferson, John Adams, Benjamin Franklin, Roger Sherman and Robert Livingston were appointed as a committee to prepare a formal Declaration of Independence.

On the first of July, 1776, the committee made its report to Congress. On the second of July, Lee's resolution was adopted in its original words. During the third of July, the formal Declaration of Independence was reported by the committee and debated with great enthusiasm. The discussion was resumed on the fourth, Jefferson having been elected as chairman of the committee.

On July 4th, there was great suspense throughout the nation. Many were adverse to severing the ties with the mother country; and many feared the vengeance of the king and his armies. Many battles had been fought already, but no decisive victory had been won by the rebel colonists. Each man in the Continental Congress realized as Patrick Henry did that it was either Liberty or Death. A rash move could mean death. After all, they were not free but subjects of a king who considered them as rebels and could punish them accordingly. They could be convicted for treason and put to death.

Just what connection did the mysterious stranger who designed the American flag and encouraged the signing of the Declaration of Independence have to Francis Bacon or Count Saint-Germain? Writing on this subject, Manly Hall says:

"Many times the question has been asked, Was Francis Bacon's vision of the "New Atlantis" a prophetic dream of the great civilization which was so soon to rise upon the soil of the New World? It cannot be doubted that the secret societies of Europe conspired to establish upon the American continent 'a new nation conceived in liberty and dedicated to the proposition that all men are created equal.' Two incidents in the early history of the United States evidence the influence of that secret body, which has so long guided the destinies of peoples and religions. By them nations are created as vehicles for the promulgation of ideals, and while nations are true to these ideals they survive; when they vary from them, they vanish like the Atlantis of old which had ceased to 'know the gods.'"

In his admirable little treatise, "Our Flag," Robert Allen Campbell revives the details of an obscure, but most important, episode of American history--the designing of the Colonial flag of 1775. The account involves a mysterious man concerning whom no information is available other than that he was on familiar terms with both General Washington and Dr. Benjamin Franklin. The following description of him is taken from Campbell's treatise:

"Little seems to have been known concerning this old gentleman; and in the materials from which this account is compiled, his name is not even once mentioned, for he is uniformly spoken of or referred to as 'the Professor.' He was evidently far beyond his threescore and ten years; and he often referred to historical events of more than a century previous just as if he had been a living witness to their occurrence; still he was erect, vigorous and active--hale, hearty and clear-minded, as strong and energetic every way as in the prime of life. He was tall, of fine figure, perfectly easy, very dignified in his manners, being at once courteous, gracious and commanding. He was, for those times, and considering the customs of the Colonists, very peculiar in his method of living; for he ate no flesh, fowl or fish; he never used for food any 'green thing', any roots or anything unripe; he drank no liquor, wine or ale; but confined his diet to cereals and their products, fruits that were ripened on the stem in the sun, nuts, mild tea and the sweet of honey, sugar and molasses.

"He was well educated, highly cultivated, of extensive as well as varied information, and very studious. He spent considerable of his time in the patient and persistent scanning of a number of very rare old books and ancient manuscripts which he seemed to be deciphering, translating or rewriting. These books, and manuscripts, together with his own writings, he never showed to anyone; and he did not even mention them in his conversations with the family, except in the most casual way; and he always locked them up carefully in a large, old-fashioned, cubically shaped, iron-bound, heavy oaken chest, whenever he left his room, even for his meals. He took long and frequent walks alone, sat on the brows of the neighboring hills, or mused in the midst of the green and flower-gemmmed meadows. He was fairly liberal--but in no way lavish--in spending his money, with which he was well supplied. He was a quiet, though a very genial and very interesting member of the family; and he was seemingly at home upon any and every topic coming up in conversation. He was, in short, one whom everyone would notice and respect, whom few would feel well acquainted with, and whom no one would presume to question concerning himself--as to whence he came, why he tarried or whither he journeyed."

"By something more than a mere coincidence, the committee appointed by the Colonial Congress to design a flag accepted an invitation to be guests, while at Cambridge, of the family with which the Professor was staying. It was here that General Washington joined them for the purpose of deciding upon a fitting emblem. By the signs that passed between them, it was evident that General Washington and Doctor Franklin recognized the Professor, and by unanimous approval, he was invited to become an active member of the committee. During the proceedings which followed, the Professor was treated with the most profound respect and all his suggestions immediately acted upon. He submitted a pattern which he considered symbolically appropriate for the new flag, and this was unhesitatingly accepted by the six other members of the committee, who voted that the arrangement suggested by the Professor be forthwith adopted. After the episode of the flag, the Professor quickly vanished; and nothing further is known concerning him.

"Did General Washington and Doctor Franklin recognize the Professor as an emissary of the Mystery School which has so long controlled the political destinies of this planet? Benjamin Franklin was a philosopher and a Freemason--possibly a Rosicrucian initiate. He and the Marquis de Lafayette--also a man of mystery--constitute two of the important links in the chain of circumstance that culminated in the establishment of the original thirteen American colonies as a free and independent nation. Dr. Franklin's philosophic attainments are well attested in *Poor Richard's Almanac*, published by him for many years under the name of Richard Saunders. His interest in the cause of Freemasonry is also shown in his publication of Anderson's *Constitutions of Freemasonry*.

"It was during the evening of July 4, 1776, that the second of these mysterious episodes occurred. In the old State House in Philadelphia, a group of men were gathered for the momentous task of severing the tie between the old country and the new. It was a grave moment, and not a few of those present feared that their lives would be the forfeit for their audacity. In the midst of the debate a fierce voice rang out. The debaters stopped and turned to look upon the stranger. Who was this man who had suddenly appeared in their midst and had transfixed them with his oratory? They had never seen him before, none knew when he had entered; but his tall form and pale face filled them with awe. His voice ringing with a holy zeal, the stranger stirred them to their very souls. His closing words rang through the building, 'God has given America to be free!' As the stranger sank into a chair exhausted, a wild enthusiasm burst forth. Name after name was placed upon the parchment: the Declaration of Independence was signed. But where was the man who had precipitated the accomplishment of this immortal task--who had lifted for a moment the veil from the eyes of the assemblage and revealed to them a part at least of the great purpose for which the new nation was conceived? He had disappeared, nor was he ever seen or his identity established. This episode parallels others of a similar kind recorded by ancient historians attendant upon the founding of every new nation. Are they coincidence, or do they indicate that the divine wisdom of the ancient mysteries still is present in the world, serving mankind as it did of old?"

END